UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. XI WINTER, 1959 No. 4

GERMANUS TOMAINO, S. A.
Prayer and Christian Unity

DEREK W. J. WHITFIELD
St. Francis and Reunion

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.
Personalities of the Council of Florence, V Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia

HAMILTON HESS
Anglicanism and Essential Unity

JEROME CORNÉLIS, A. A.
The Centenary of a Memorable Russian Priest, Father Gregory Schuvaloff

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
A Papal Letter Commending the Octave of Prayer
Possibilities of Reunion as Seen by Two Prelates of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches
An Anglican Commentary on the North Indian Plan of Reunion
A Report on the Ecumenical Endeavors of the Community of Taizé

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — BOOK REVIEWS
INDEX FOR 1959

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF THE ATONEMENT, GRAYMOOR, GARRISON, N. Y.

Imprimatur:

Rome, January 23, 1960

† Hector Cunial
Archiep. Soteropolitan., Vicesgerens

ROME - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRAYER AND CHRISTIAN UNITY

Even the most casual observer of the world scene over the past number of years will have noticed the widespread concern among separated Christian groups regarding the problem of disunity. Ever since the formation of the World Council of Churches in 1948, particularly, has this question been kept before the public eye, for the delegates at that Assembly declared it their specific intention to work for the attainment of Christian unity. And over the ten years or so that have followed its organization the World Council, especially through its division of Faith and Order, has done much to lay the ground work for the eventual unity of its member churches, which, apart from a small number of Orthodox groups, represent the greater part of world Protestantism.

As our readers know, the epoch-making event of Amsterdam was itself the outcome of the ecumenical movement launched by Bishop Charles Brent at Edinburgh in 1910. The address of Bishop Brent to the missionary delegates on that occasion was a clarion call to divided Christian bodies to close their ranks for a more effective presentation of the Gospel message to the world.

The movement, which was later to fuse into one the two currents of Life and Work and of Faith and Order, went ahead gradually but surely over the years, winning adherence not only among many Protestant denominations, but sympathy and encouragement from Catholics and Orthodox as well. The two world wars were a crippling blow to extensive organized efforts for the ecumenical cause, but even these calamities were a further and compelling incentive to work for the realization of unity. In fact, the end of the second world war saw the beginning of an amazing unitive activity among Christian groups, particularly in Germany and in other countries on the continent.

In late years this activity has in no way diminished, but instead has been growing apace. In truth, it is one of the signs of the times. Not only within the sphere of the World Council, but in many other sectors as well, there have been copious conferences, lectures, private discussions, and extensive research on the question of Christian unity, as well as a prodigious amount of

literature on the subject. The great relevance, for example, that the world press gave last January to the proclamation of the forthcoming Ecumenical Council by Pope John XXIII and later to the World Council Committee meeting at Rhodes this past August is an indication of the deep and abiding interest with which the ideal of unity has come to be regarded by the Christian world at large. On every side there seems to be a willingness, as never before, to study and discuss, to comprehend and to co-operate.

This change of atmosphere, which is such a striking feature of our day, has been variously explained; like many other things in everyday life, its make-up involves the confluence of different factors. Yet, it would be safe to say that the prayers for unity which have been said by so many earnest Christians have had a great deal to do with bringing about this state of affairs. As a statement of the Holy See in 1949 with reference to the ecumenical movement expressed it, — « At this time in many parts of the world, *due chiefly to the common prayers of the faithful,* a desire has awakened and is growing daily in the hearts of many, who are separated from the Catholic Church, that a reunion be accomplished among all who believe in Christ the Lord ».

Certainly it is only natural that prayer should occupy an important place in the efforts for the attainment of Christian unity. If at the time of the Last Supper, Christ, in view of the frailty of human nature, prayed that His followers be preserved in unity, a fortiori is prayer necessary for a return to a lost unity. Moreover, the ideal of unity among Christians is based upon the supernatural; indeed, in the prayer of Christ this visible unity was to serve as a motivation of faith to unbelievers. And for the realization of this doubtless divine assistance is indispensable — an assistance that is promised to the prayer of faith.

It was the truth of this that was so clearly recognized by Father Paul Wattson when he inaugurated his Church Unity Octave of prayer in 1908. Writing that year in the magazine *The Lamp* which he edited, Father Wattson declared: « Under the divine blessing, let us hope that this Church Unity observance, so auspiciously begun, may be kept with increasing enthusiasm by increasing numbers year after year until our Lord's prayer « ut omnes unum sint » is completely fulfilled ».

It is interesting to note, too, that less than ten years after the Edinburgh Conference this same conviction about the necessity of prayer was reflected in an appeal to observe the January Octave made to all Protestants and Orthodox by the Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church on Faith and Order. In the circular letter of 1919 containing the appeal, the Commission stated: « The

World Conference on Faith and Order is an attempt to bring Christians together in true Christian love and humility to try to understand and appreciate one another, and to prepare the way for constructive effort for that visible unity which is necessary to convince and convert the world to its Redeemer. Already many partial and local efforts are being made toward Reunion. It cannot be doubted that God the Holy Spirit is inspiring and guiding them ... But if progress is to be made toward the visible Reunion of Christians, it can come only from the deep desire of the whole Church; and that desire can only find its effective manifestation, its only means of achievement, through *incessant and fervent prayer* ».

During the past year, likewise, Pope John XXIII has frequently appealed for the prayers of the faithful to insure the success of the coming Ecumenical Council, and in a very recent letter to the Father General of the Society of the Atonement, the community founded by Father Paul Wattson, His Holiness writes: « Prayer, in fact, is the *first* and *principal means* to be used to bring about this yearned-for unity » (1).

As is evident to every practicing Christian, nothing but good can come from genuine prayer. From the pages of Sacred Scripture he knows that it is intimately bound up with the Christian way of life. He has before him the teaching and example of Christ Himself on this point, as well as that of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Apostles who persevered in prayer before the great day of Pentecost. He knows, too, that prayer disposes the mind and heart for the truths of faith and that it inspires one both « to will and to accomplish » — a necessary disposition if genuine unity is to be attained. Moreover, the sincere Christian is aware of the divine assurance that believing prayer will be heard. Thus, he will give to prayer an important place in the quest for unity. He will see in the progress made so far the fruit of constant supplication, and encouraged by it he will join his prayer willingly to that of Christ for the unity of His followers. The vision of a better world will spur him on, and his love for Christ will urge him to do his part by fervent prayer in hastening the day when the Saviour's words will come true: « Other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd ».

GERMANUS TOMAINO, S. A.

---

(1) Cf. the documentary section of this number of *Unitas*.

SAINT FRANCIS AND REUNION (*)

Reflections on the Relevance of Francis of Assisi's Ideals to Current Oecumenical Thought

A famous cardinal once called Saint Francis « the Saint of Unity ». One may wonder, at first, why St Francis should be given this title: we identify him readily with love, poverty, humility, self-sacrifice — but Unity? Where is the direct connection? I want to suggest a train of thought spanning seven centuries, which may well establish Francis in the minds and hearts of those who love him, whether Catholic or Protestant, as the *Pontifex Maximus* of Unity — the great Bridge Maker of Western Christendom who will (if we let him) span the chasm which separates the non-Roman churches from the Roman Church and from each other.

« If a man love Me, he will keep My words », said our Lord. So also might St Francis, the human pattern of our Lord, say; and if we keep the words and intentions of Francis we shall come to that unity in the Mystical Body of Christ for which Jesus prayed, « that they all may be one ... that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me ». Is there any need for us to be reminded of the tremendous importance of achieving this unity — that the world may believe? Yes, there is! Modern experience of Reunion schemes, moreover, shows another need, too: we need to be real and absolute, not just a decision to assume an outward appearance of unity which does not in fact reflect our inner hearts and minds. One-ness in Christ — a unity of heart and mind and soul in essential principles, that is what we have to seek. And to light our path, we have St Francis.

(*) (Although writing from a Roman Catholic standpoint, the author has avoided controversial interpretations of St Francis's views as far as possible. Many Protestants sincerely think that Francis would have been a Protestant if he had lived today, but in view of what is historically known about his beliefs and principles, it is felt that the onus of proof lies upon those who would claim him as at heart a « non-Roman »!

For convenience, as well as from conviction, I have throughout equated the word « Catholic » with « Roman Catholic »).

Christian disunity in the time of Francis

750 years ago the Order of St Francis was founded. In the thirteenth century, Protestantism as we know it today was yet unborn. Even so, the Church had her troubles: the world was « growing cold » in religion, and as always happens when indifferent churchmen fail to live up to their faith, heretical sects had sprung up in an attempt to restate religion so as to suit contemporary needs. The heretic is always a powerful and a tragic figure. Those who revolt against authority nearly always tend to dangerous extremes: there is always a danger that when they break the chains which bound them they will drift away into uncharted seas, not of liberty, but of licence or anarchy. The age of the Crusades brought Christian soldiers into close contact with peoples of non-Christian belief, and it was largely this factor which crystallised such sub-Christian heresies in Europe as the Manichees. the Cathari and the Albigenses, fanatic sects who were threatening the unity of Christendom at the time when unity was essential in face of the Moslem threat from the East. (There is a parallel here with the mid-twentieth century world-situation — an obvious parallel, but it deserves to be pondered). From the Church's point of view, the problem on the « home front » needed to be tackled on two different levels, the intellectual and the popular — in the mind and in the heart, one might say, for these are two doorways to the soul.

God raised up in thirteenth century Europe the two men who were capable of tackling the problem at these levels, Saints Dominic and Francis, who founded respectively the Order of Preachers and the Order of Friars Minor. The Dominican Order set out to reconquer indifference and heresy by scholastic teaching, the Franciscan Order by example of living according to the Holy Gospels: that the two were complementary to each other was symbolised by the historic meeting and friendship of the two saints. But their methods were different. Dominic aimed at producing an intellectual *elite,* to capture the brains of Christendom for orthodoxy; Francis cast his net wide, aiming at the little-educated masses — the poor, the despised, the outcasts, as well as the non-intellectual nobility, the « middle classes » and the ordinary clergy. His was the message of repentance and simplicity, of love and peace. The healing of discord in any form was a major aspect of his mission — and it is in acknowledgment of this that we claim him as the Saint of Unity.

> « Proclaim peace to all, saying, 'The Lord give thee peace!' But as ye proclaim peace with your mouth, so have it yet more in your heart. Let none through you be moved to wrath or scandal, but let all be moved by your gentleness to peace, kindness and concord. For our vocation is to heal the wounded, to bind up the broken, and to call back the erring. For many will seem to you members of the devil who shall yet be disciples of Christ » (1).

Before we go any further, let us re-read that last sentence, and search our consciences. Do we (subconsciously, at least) regard our separated brethren in other denominations as members of the devil ...?

Rebels for unity

Francis, then, was God's answer to the problem of disunity and discord amongst common men, whether in the Church or in the world, at a time when the forces of disruption were reaching a crisis. He was, in the words of an Anglican writer (2), « an agent for transmitting the divine love to those about him ». Another non-Catholic interpreter of St Francis (3) emphasises that « the aim of all his instructions to his followers was finally that of producing and upholding between them a perfect unity, 'to the end that those who had been drawn by the same spirit and begotten by the same father might be peacefully nurtured in the bosom of one mother' » (4).

There is a special sense in which Francis and those whom I would call « non-conformists » (5) should have a sympathy with each other. The cynic, indeed, might make out a case for the view that St Francis should be the patron of all « non-conformists ». He would point out that Francis was a rebel himself against the « Blimps » of the Roman Court, and that so many of his followers turned against Rome in movements that have become famous in

---

(1) St Francis's Commission to the brethren: Wadding, *Opuscula* (Florence, 1880), 272.

(2) E. Hermitage Day, *St Francis and the Greyfriars* (Mowbray, 1926), p. 59.

(3) D. H. S. Nicholson, *Mysticism of St Francis of Assisi* (Cape, 1923), p. 368.

(4) This quotation (one of the most striking illustrations of my whole thesis in this article) is from Celano's second Life of St Francis, 191.

(5) *I. e.* non-Romans. I use the term in an unusual sense, to mean those who do not conform to the Roman Church, which of course was the sole established religious authority in western Europe in the middle ages.

history: William of Occam, the Franciscan philosopher who championed Emperor against Pope on a political issue; Michael of Cesena and the Fraticelli, who refused to accept the papal interpretation of Franciscan Poverty; even that good English Franciscan of the seventeenth century, Francis a Sancta Clara, who wrote a book to prove that the Prayer Book Articles were capable of Catholic interpretation. These are in themselves facts, of course, and no cause can be served by ignoring facts; but cynical or sentimental interpretation of the facts will not help, either. There is more to be said about each of the cases just mentioned: this is not the place to say it in detail, and I touch on these issues only so that they may not be allowed to vitiate my basic premise, that the essence of true Franciscanism is Roman Catholicism, and that this is likewise the essence of true Unity. Of the vitally important point of St Francis's attitude to the Papacy, more must be said later. William of Occam was one of the great philosophers of the Western tradition, and whatever his political affiliations he remained orthodox doctrinally. The Fraticelli were a tragic band who rushed into heresy for the dubious reason that they preferred their own austere interpretation of evangelical Poverty to that of the Pope, as though austerity in itself were the end aimed at: no one can doubt their intense sincerity, and private judgment has come to be a prerogative of Protestants in matters of faith, but they will not do as « proto-Protestants », for there is a fact which historians rarely notice; the Fraticelli did not rebel against the authority of the Papacy as such — they held instead something very different, namely that the Pope himself had misused the authority that was rightfully his (6). As for Sancta Clara, while his book on the Thirty Nine Articles is often cited as an argument from the Roman side for the Catholicity of the Church of England, it would be only fair to acknowledge that he later, retracted his arguments, his ultimate opinion being, like Newman's, that the Articles were not capable of Catholic interpretation.

Individualism

The underlying fact remains, of course, that Francis was indeed an individualist — the fragment of grit, so to speak, which by irritating the the oyster produces the pearl — and individualism

(6) (This has been recently confirmed by a manuscript discovered in the county archives of Bedfordshire, England.) That this tenet should justify them in renouncing the papal obedience is, and was, heretical teaching, of course; my point is that it does not establish these wayward followers of St Francis as Protestants in the Reformation sense.

has always been a distinguishing feature of the Franciscan Order. So we are faced with the paradox that within an Order bound to the discipline of a Rule existed a fundamental individualism, which militated against that discipline. Individualism has come to be regarded as a mark of Protestantism, discipline of Catholicism. Both are excellent qualities, but they are like the lion and the lamb — both excellent animals; yet it is only in the context of the Bible that they can be made to lie down together. Between the lion and the lamb is a wide difference of character, upbringing and *ethos* which makes them — though they share a unity of life, as creatures of God — in nature irreconcilable. But St Francis, the creatture of light, of super-nature, bridges the gap, reconciles the seemingly irreconcilable, resolves the paradox — and points the way for the return to Catholic Unity of all Protestants, of whatever kind, everywhere.

We have reached here the crucial point of the message of St Francis for those who desire the unity of Christendom, and I suggest that all of us — Catholic or Protestant — would do well to deepen our understanding of the mind (and heart) of Francis in this matter. We cannot fail thus to come to a deeper understanding of each other as a preliminary to the ultimate *rapprochement*. Yet let us first be sure that we see Francis in true perspective. I am sure that a great many non-Catholic lovers of St Francis have never thought of him as a papist, nor indeed as anything but an individual who spent his life converting individuals. This is to do him less than justice, for Francis worked in and for the visible Church, the Roman Church, of which he was a support. This is how we must think of the historic Francis. If he, of all people, could not only accept but explicitly insist on the necessity of abiding in unity with the Roman Church, then those of us who follow him must surely be of one mind with him in this as in other things: otherwise, we are something less than Franciscan. It is true that for many of us, this is an aspect of Francis's belief which, fundamental though it is, can only be accepted later. Ultimately, however, it must be accepted. Yet here is a point of contact which Francis is able to establish with Protestants. As the late Harold Goad noted in his book *Greyfriars*, all the first companions of St Francis had strong personal characters — Masseo, Bernard, Giles and Leo spring to mind; the tradition of individuality was there from the beginning, and later as the Order expanded it became a problem.

The Individualist and Authority

In his own lifetime, Francis was faced with the task of reconciling liberty with discipline, strong personal feelings with loyalty to the common Rule. We know that some, like Elias, opposed Francis himself from what has been thought an excess of zeal or worldly wisdom; others, after his death, championed their own interpretation of Francis's will against the Pope's interpretation. There was much dispute about this within the Order itself, and some fell into heresy or mere vagrancy. The friars of the Order in its first two centuries of existence were walking constantly on a tightrope between the acceptance and the rejection of Authority. The astonishing — and vitally significant — thing is that St Francis himself, although he led his followers over the tightrope, never showed the slightest tendency to fall down on the side of rejection. It is often said that he had no alternative in his day but to remain in the papal obedience — the implication usually is that he would have become an Anglican if it had then been possible! Yet the Fraticelli proved that it *was* possible to leave the Roman obedience: the simple truth is that Francis was *vir totus Catholicus et Apostolicus*. The conclusion is inescapable: it was a cardinal point of his faith that, whatever the evils he might see within the Church, whatever the frustrations he might encounter from the highest seat of Authority, he *could not* abandon his loyalty to the Pope, the Vicar of Christ. Indeed, in his Rule he unequivocally insisted that Brother Francis (and he bound his successors with him in perpetuity) « promises obedience to the Pope » in all things; and the same was implicit in all that he did. That is where the Fraticelli proved their disloyalty to St Francis. It seems to me that prevarication can deny that this was the central pivot of Francis's faith: absolute obedience — and its corollary, a horror of heterodoxy. Heterdoxy and unorthodoxy, after all, are quite distinct in meaning. Perhaps it will help if we point to the *unorthodoxy* of St Francis's methods, and then conclude that his appeal to non-Catholics may well be this: « Be as unorthodox as you like — that is the secret of my impact — but heterodox, never! » — All the world's greatest religious leaders have tended to unorthodoxy in method: John Wesley and William Booth, for example, have this in common with St Francis, that they were prepared to adopt a *contemporary* approach to religion, and to take religion to those who were most neglected by the Churchmen of their day. (Indeed, the early Salvationists directly imitated the technique of the early Franciscans by adapting popular songs to religious lyrics — « Why

should the Devil have all the best tunes? » And today, a similar movement exists both within and without the Catholic Church). With Francis, the unorthodox was the means to the end; the end itself was entirely orthodox, the Faith of Rome.

Nicholson (7) tried hard to prove that Francis was anti-authoritarian at heart and would have broken from the papacy if he had been given either the chance or sufficient provocation. He does indeed admit that « it would be going against the facts to say that he was in a condition of open rebellion, and against the whole tendency of his life to deny that in the main he was obedient to (the Church's) leading ». He then devotes some space to painting a picture of St Francis as the embryo Protestant, repeatedly « forcing his own God-sent convinctions on a very unwilling authority ». Nicholson is clearly implying that God-sent convictions were not welcome at Rome; what he appears not to have appreciated is that Francis deemed it necessary to do things *through* that Authority. Authority might be unwilling, but still Authority must be won to Francis's side. The solution to his problems was never the solution of the Reformation — rejection of Authority and sole reliance on one's own inner conviction and guidance. Nicholson, in fact, proves the point which he is trying to disprove, *viz,* that Francis may have had to struggle with Authority, but he never acted without first having won it to his side. There was indeed another, a forerunner of St Francis, whose history helps to highlight this aspect of the truth about Francis; that was Peter Waldo, who only a generation before had petitioned the Pope to approve an « evangelical » rule, but who had met with resistance and defected from the Church in consequence. The Waldenses (as they were called, when they became a heretical sect), acquiesced in the Curia's obtuseness, and by-passed Authority: St Francis, on other hand, penetrated the obtuseness and canalised Authority according to the Will of the Holy Spirit.

Francis and the Papacy

We have arrived at the basic question underlying all Christian discord — where does Authority reside? Of St Francis's answer to that question there can be no reasonable doubt; hence his insistence on absolute obedience to Rome — obedience based on charity. The Lord gave Francis faith to recognise the Presence of Jesus in every Catholic church throughout the world. « After that », Francis tells us in his *Testament,*

---

(7) *Mysticism,* pp. 93 *seq.*

« the Lord gave me, as He gives me still, so much faith in priests who live according to the form of the Holy Roman Church, on account of their Order, that even if they persecuted me I would have recourse to them. And if I had as much wisdom as Solomon had, and I found priests of this world, poor and lowly, I would not preach against their will ... and I would pay no regard to any sin in them, because in them I see the Son of God ».

These words were dictated at the end of his life — the considered and explicitly expressed opinion of one on whom the marks of the Lord Jesus were already set. Absolute obedience to the Vicar of Christ, based on absolute Love for all the creatures of God. This, I aver, is the essential message of St Francis, which must be understood, and without qualification of any kind. To call oneself Franciscan it is not sufficient to be merely attracted to St Francis, though the attraction of his personality alone is still powerful after seven centuries. It is not sufficient to follow him with a mental reservation that one of his cardinal tenets is not acceptable. It is not sufficient even to recognise that St Francis insisted on obedience to the Pope, unless we understand his very reasons for insisting. We must understand that when the papacy not only ratified, but assumed control of the Rule of the Order of St Francis, it was not in spite of St Francis, but *at his request*, and because he knew that only thus could his Rule receive the absolute approval of God (8). We must be prepared, moreover, whether we are Catholics or not, to revise our *personal* interpretation of St Francis if we are to know him as he really was, and not as we would like him to have been. Some of the accidentals relating to the Seraphic Father, for instance, would not have been to our liking if he had been our companion in this age of hygiene — and we should have found his behaviour in public embarrassing in the extreme!

St Francis is everyone's saint

Francis has it in him to attract all « men of good will » towards him, by one aspect or another of his character. He is known and loved by many who have no formal Christian beliefs, though

(8) This fact is reaffirmed by the latest scholarship applied to St Francis's life: see especially, R. B. Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government* (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 56 *seq.* Papal control was « not imposed from above, but conceded at St Francis's own request » (*ibid.*, p. 61).

it is true that these see in him mainly a sentimental appeal, as one who loved his fellow-creatures and went about doing good. A weak appeal, this; but still, a starting point from which the real Francis can later, by God's grace, emerge. The most evangelical Protestants love him for what they would call his « conviction of sin », and his personal relationship with Christ crucified: his Pauline devotion to the Passion is one of the great common factors which Francis shares between Catholics and Protestants alike, as also are his devotion to the Gospel and his mission to spread the love of God amongst all men. It was the primitive simplicity of Francis's Rule which made its appeal to men in the saint's own time, as we may see from a letter of Jacques de Vitry written in 1220:

> « The Order is multiplying tremendously throughout the world, and precisely because it practises the form of life of the primitive Church and the Apostles in all things ».

The Catholic-minded sections of the Church of England have accepted his challenge courageously at different times, and efforts have been made to reproduce his three Orders in an Anglican setting; the earliest of these was the American « Society of the Atonement » which, founded in 1899, was received in 1909 as a community into the Roman Church and affiliated to the Franciscan Order while retaining its original identity. In England we have seen the Anglican « Brotherhood of the Holy Cross », which for some years laboured in the poorest parts of London in the true spirit of St Francis: and still flourishing today is the Society of Saint Francis with its headquarters at Cerne Abbas in Dorset, whose work extends in many fields throughout England and in Rhodesia. I have been told that even within the « Polish Old Catholic Church » there is a Franciscan movement. Clearly, Francis qualifies as the Saint of Unity, and he will draw into the One True Fold all men who are sincerely concerned to realise in themselves the fullness of his spirit. Many have already been drawn into that Unity of St Francis — if not corporately as in the case of the Society of the Atonement, at any rate (and it is not always realised that this is actually far more urgent) individually. Francis has been the agent, the interpreter of Christ's will — God's sheep dog we might call him — but the paths by which he has coaxed his followers into the Fold have been very different. The present writer, for instance, started by research into the history of St Francis and his Order for a British University degree: working thus from the viewpoint of an impartial observer outside the Church, he came *firstly* to love Francis as a person and to wish to follow him, however

imperfectly, and *secondly* (and much later) to realise that a prerequisite of this is to follow him within that Mother Church to which Francis *had* to belong.

The greatest enemy of Unity

I have met many Catholics who shamed the Church — I have been, I am sorry to say, one of them. I have met many Protestants who would be a credit to the Catholic Church. To use a modern idiom, what a waste of man-power this is! Why, then, do we not see it as a practical necessity for survival that we should make every effort to solve our differences, and unite for the love of Christ? The reason, I think, is simply that Catholics and Protestants have this much in common — the frailty and imperfection of human nature, the old Adam in us, which gives rise to that greatest of all enemies to Christian Unity, prejudice. I suspect that, in the war against Religion, the devil's most effective weapons are prejudice and its accomplice self-righteousness. Prejudice is the Old Man whom we are to put off when we put on the armour of light. Prejudice and self-righteousness are the subtlest of weapons, for they attack the most spiritually advanced of the soldiers of Christ. They put blinkers on the soul, they restrict its vision even when it is truly focussed upon God, they prevent it from seeing all men as brothers in God. The devil has chosen his weapons well, for now we see the urgency of our plight only as in a glass, darkly.

Protestants are nurtured in an atmosphere of prejudice against the Catholic Church; Catholics too often feel unthinkingly that Protestants for their belief choose what they like, and reject what they dislike. Between the two there is a great gulf fixed. And over the centuries of division, Protestantism has built up its own *ethos*, or « atmosphere », and Catholicism has evolved its *ethos* on a divergent course — so that each speaks its own language with its own characteristic terminology (what does « conviction of sin » mean to a Catholic, or « praying for the Pope's intentions » to a Protestant?); and a Protestant entering a Catholic church can rarely feel « at home ». A small point, you may say, and soon overcome when there is the *will* to overcome. Yet it is symptomatic of that great gulf — and surely, « feeling at home » is of great psychological importance in the initial stages of conversion. Even an « extreme » Anglo-Catholic finds that the externals of Catholic worship strike a discord in his soul, however anxious he may be to achieve union with Rome. Fundamentally these are prejudices, which, based mainly on externals, hold us back from each other.

And self-righteousness — the feeling that we in *our* denomination are every bit as good Christians as those in another, if not better — confirms us in our spiritual reserve. So, we do not progress in reality towards unity, though we may talk of it most seriously in conferences, in sermons, in « reunion societies », even in our prayers. Prejudice thrives on the half-truth and the direct lie, the sneer and the innuendo familiar to all who try to discuss Catholicism with Protestants. Let each one of us examine himself on his fund of Christian charity before he tries to come to an understanding with Christians of other denominations; each of us is still in need of a measure of conversion in his heart. Francis teaches us love and humility, obedience and self-denial. We must make an effort, cultivate a *will* to understand our separated brethren; whether we are Catholics or not, the need to train ourselves in this is vital and imperative. The first move must come, not from the Roman side or the Protestant side or the Greek side, but from *within* us. Then, we may follow St Francis and the end will be sure!

As Pope John XXIII said recently in an audience with an Anglican Canon (to who mthe Holy Father presented his breviary), « In working for reunion it is necessary firstly to be very meek and humble, secondly to be patient and know how to await God's hour ». It is in the first requirement that St Francis can be our guide — that principal pre-requisite which our Holy Father recognises but which seems not to have been thought of by most of the zealous workers for reunion. « Let all be moved by your gentleness to peace, kindness and concord » — « that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art one in me, and I in thee ».

DEREK W. J. WHITFIELD, T.O.S.F.

Monmouth, England, and
Kampala, Uganda, 1959

PERSONALITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

V. Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia.

Isidore, whose family name is not known, was born probably in Monembasia, almost the most southerly town of southern Greece, between the years 1380 and 1390. Secure information about his earlier years is scarce. There are, however, hints and allusions in the few letters of his and other personal documents that have been preserved, sufficient to establish a landmark here and there. The writer of a eulogium to welcome Manuel II back to Constantinople after his long voyage in the West (1403) speaks of the previous lack of teachers as he himself had suffered from it — presumably in the years of siege — and is grateful for the return of the philosopher Emperor, the reopening of the schools, and indeed for a kind of scholarship which he enjoyed. That writer was probably Isidore, in Constantinople from some little time before 1403 for purposes of study. It must have been then that he met the Italian Guarino Veronese, one of the first of the many Italian humanists who journeyed to Constantinople to study Greek on the spot. In later years there was a correspondence between these two, mainly about the manuscripts that Isidore was procuring and sending to his friend in Italy. The well-known Xenophon, now in the library of Wolfenbüttel, was a gift of his to Guarino.

Isidore returned to the Peloponnese in 1409, the bearer of an oration written by the Emperor Manuel for the anniversary of the death of his brother Theodore. He seems to have remained in the Peloponnese for the next twenty years or so, in the course of which he became a monk in the monastery of St. Michael and the Angels of Monembasia, and came under the influence of George Gemistus Pletho. Gemistus lived in Mistra and was a phenomenon of the Greek humanistic world. He had given himself the surname, Pletho, to perpetuate the fame of his hero, the philosopher Plato, in whose thought he had so steeped himself as finally to have become more pagan than Christian. He enjoyed a great reputation for learning and possessed a wide influence in humanistic circles in Greece. Mark Eugenicus and Bessarion certainly studied under him; Isidore probably did, for his writings at this time display a

decided Platonic tendency and an antagonism to Aristotle, which was the characteristic of Gemistus's thought.

In 1429 Isidore, on behalf of the Metropolitan of Monembasia, wrote two letters to the authorities in Constantinople, exposing with great vigour the reasons why two dioceses of the Province of Monembasia should not be put under the jurisdiction of Corinth. In the event, the better to defend the integrity of his native place and to uphold the rights of his archbishop, he was sent to Constantinople to plead the cause in person. His return journey was adventurous. The ship he was in was forced as far out of course as Sicily, and so Isidore on 25 September 1429 gazed from the sea on 'the great castles of Sicily' as the ship fared from Palermo to Syracuse. In 1430 he was back in the Peloponnese, for there is extant in his handwriting a complicated explanation, dating from that year, of a prophecy about the Hexamilion (the wall of fortification that spanned the Isthmus of Corinth), and the solution of another similar prophecy, founded on intricate mathematical calculations, in which he foretold the speedy end of Greece's enemies. These writings are interesting, not only because they add another fixed date to Isidore's very sparse biography, but also because they illustrate a lesser known side of his character, for Isidore was a polymath with an interest in all kinds of learned and semi-learned subjects.

In 1433 the Council of Basel sent two envoys to the court of John VIII, whereupon the Emperor appointed three Greeks to accompany them back to Basel to negotiate in his name. One of the Greek envoys was Isidore, not long recovered from an illness and by now Superior of the Constantinopolitan monastery of St. Demetrius. Their journey was ill-starred from the first. They set out on 11 November 1433, but because of a violent storm had to return. More successfully they left again on 18 January 1434, survived very bad weather in the Black Sea, continued their journey overland by Wallachia (Rumania) and Hungary, fell among bandits and were robbed, but contrived to reach Buda where they managed to raise enough money to take them to Ulm to meet the Emperor Sigismund, for whom they carried letters from their sovereign. They entered Basel on 12 July.

By this time the relations between the Council of Basel and Pope Eugenius were strained to the uttermost. The Pope's attempt to prorogue the Council had been resisted by the Fathers; most of the western princes and universities attracted by the Council's programme of Church reform had rallied to its support; the greater part of the cardinals, making as it were a 'friend of the mammon of iniquity', had openly or covertly pledged their adherence; the

Duke of Milan, claiming to act for the Council, had produced revolt in Rome, and Eugenius by 24 July 1434 had taken refuge in Florence. The sending of conciliar envoys to Constantinople without reference to the Pope was part of the anti-papal policy of the Council, for hitherto it had been popes Martin V and Eugenius IV, who had negotiated with the Eastern Church. When therefore Alberto de Crispis returned with three Greek envoys, it was something of a triumph, and the Council showed its delight by the almost extravagant honour it paid the Greeks. They were met, on their arrival, outside the city walls by all except the Presidents, lodged sumptuously and, when they were formally presented to the Council, the President Cesarini made a long discourse. The Greek answer was given a few days later by Isidore, whose speech was translated into Latin by the humanist, Giovanni Aurispa. This speech displays Isidore as a master of Greek prose and an accomplished orator; courteous, polished, stressing perhaps a little excessively (intelligibly, however, in the circumstances) the extent and consequent importance of the Greek Church; like Cesarini, not insisting overmuch on the differences that divided the two Churches.

The Greek legation had brought with it the draft agreement made in the last days of Martin V. The arrangements arrived at with Basel were based on that. The Council of union should be held in some town of Italy, Buda, Vienna or, at the most, Savoy; and at the expense of Basel, provision to be made also for the defence of Constantinople. This pact between the Council and the Greek envoys was solemnly approved by the Fathers on 7 September 1434 as the decree *Sicut pia mater,* and the Greeks promised on oath to do their best to ensure its fulfilment.

Meanwhile the Pope had been in negotiation with the Emperor John VIII and had agreed to a council in Constantinople, which was very much more to the likings of the Greeks. John, therefore, wrote to tell his ambassadors in Basel to suspend operations pending the arrival of more envoys. The new instructions, however, came to the three Greeks too late; and when the Fathers heard of them they suspected that they had been hoodwinked, and their former graciousness turned into suspicion and illwill. Isidore proclaimed his innocence, but it was not till there came to Basel the new Greek envoys, accredited to the Pope but sent on by him to the Council, that harmony was restored and the decree *Sicut pia mater* confirmed anew. Shortly after, Isidore went to Venice and thence to Constantinople in the company of three envoys sent to the Byzantine court by the Council.

The Greeks of the capital strongly resented certain words in the preamble of the decree that the envoys from Basel brought

with them. They even proposed a new one, which a committee that included Isidore prepared. There were other frictions also, in which Garatoni, the papal representative, was involved, and Isidore (so Ragusa, one of the Baseler envoys, reported) sided with him. In the nominations of procurators for the eastern patriarchates, Isidore was chosen for Jerusalem; later, however, he was appointed to represent Antioch instead. But the greatest sign of confidence in him that the authorities of Constantinople showed came shortly after, when they selected him to fill the vacant See of Kiev and All Russia. In 1436 he was consecrated and then he set off for Moscow, at that time the seat of the Metropolitan, arriving on 2 April 1437. His first task was to arrange for the Russian Church to be represented at the forthcoming council of union.

Vasili, the Great Prince of Moscow, was not particularly pleased to see him. For one thing, he had sent to Constantinople Jonas, his own candidate for the metropolitan See, but he was too late; for another, he was more interested in the union of all the Russian princedoms under his own hegemony than he was in union of Churches. Isidore had a hard time persuading the prince to let him return to a council of union, especially as he would be representing the Church of Russia and wanted other representatives and an escort on a scale befitting its importance. It is said that Vasili yielded only when the new Metropolitan swore not to bring back with him a faith different from that of the first seven Councils. It is more than doubtful whether Isidore took any such oath, but, even if he did, the faith of the union that he brought back four years later was in fact and in his belief the genuine faith of the early Church.

After a stay of only five months in Moscow the new Metropolitan started on his return journey. The company included Avrami, Bishop of Susdal, the Archimandrite Vassian, the priest Symeon, Gregory the Greek monk who had accompanied Isidore from Constantinople, and various other monks and servants. At Tver, Prince Boris appointed one of his nobles, Thomas, to join the mission. Arrived at Pskov, Isidore satisfied its inhabitants (and doubtless pleased Vasili of Moscow) by detaching that diocese from the jurisdiction of Novgorod and putting it directly under himself, for that purpose appointing a vicar. He reached Riga on 4 February, where, on being refused permission by Sigismund of Lithuania to cross his territory, he had to wait till the sea was unfrozen to go to Lubeck by ship (5 May). There the Bishop, who had temporally espoused the cause of Eugenius against Basel (Isidore was still under the impression that all were agreed in

following *Sicut pia mater*), directed him to the Pope in Ferrara. The journey has been described by one of Isidore's Russian companions, who was full of wonder at the stone houses, bridges, vineyards and the rest that they saw in place after place along the way, till they arrived in Ferrara on 18 August 1438. There the plague was raging, and several of the Russians soon fell victims to it.

The Greeks had already been in Ferrara for more than six months and were beginning to be tired of their self-imposed inactivity. The prospect of the arrival of representatives from the western princes seemed remote; the Pope was running short of money and was behindhand with his payments; the Latins were anxious to get down to business and be gone, and so there was general agreement to proceed with the main purpose of the Council, the discussion of doctrine. Each side was to have six speakers. As one of theirs the Greeks elected Isidore. The only two of the six Greek speakers, however, who made set speeches were Mark Eugenicus and Bessarion. Isidore, it is recorded, made himself heard once in the altercation about procedure that occupied most of the second session, and there have been preserved drafts, incomplete, of three speeches that he set himself to prepare for use in the earlier sessions, as well as of a longer work, comprising fifty-two arguments, but still incomplete, begun on 14 November, in answer to Cardinal Cesarini's presentation of the Latin case. There is no record of his having delivered any of these in public; their unfinished state would also seem to preclude it.

The documents of the Council make no further mention of Isidore till the end of March 1439. The Russian, however, who told the story of the journey to Ferrara, describes also the journey from there to Florence, on which he found, apparently, some consolation amidst the hazards of mountain travel in winter in 'a very good, sweet red wine' produced in those parts. Isidore left Ferrara on 27 January 1439 and reached Florence on 4 February, the first of the Greeks to arrive.

The sessions in Florence were conducted by only one of the chosen orators from either side — John of Montenero, O. P. for the Latins, Mark Eugenicus for the Greeks. Each of these, towards the end, expounded at length the arguments for his view. When Montenero had finished his exposition (24 March), it was Isidore who replied in a few words, demanding time to consider it and requesting a written text, especially of the quotations made from the Latin Fathers.

That was the last meeting in the regular series of public sessions. The months that followed were taken up with private debates among the Greeks and occasional contact with the Latins.

The morale of the Greek community was low. Most of them had not been persuaded by the Latin arguments, but they had been silenced because the Latins never seemed to lack for an answer. Now they were determined to undergo no more public discussions; if the Latins could not find some other way of producing agreement, they wanted to go home. Isidore was one of four delegates sent to convey this ultimatum to the Pope. There was, however, a compact group among the Greeks convinced that the faiths of the two Churches were in essentials identical. The best theologians were of its number — Bessarion, Isidore (both of the chosen six speakers), Gregory the imperial confessor, Dorotheus of Mitylene, and two out of the three lay 'philosophers' brought by the Emperor to advise him, George Amiroutzes and George Scholarius. The only Greek theologian of note on the other side was Mark Eugenicus, and he was adamant in his opposition.

The consequent tension among the Greek ecclesiastics made itself felt in all their meetings. The unionists, foremost among them Bessarion and Isidore, were harping on one theme — that the saints of both Churches, inspired as they were by the same Holy Spirit, could teach only one doctrine, even though it might be expressed in different ways. They were appealing to a principle which they themselves believed, which Mark Eugenicus believed, which all the Greek prelates believed. Towards the middle of April, Bessarion and George Scholarius delivered before the Greek synod long addresses to demonstrate the harmony of the saints. But for the time being their efforts produced no perceptible effect. Meantime an expedient suggested by the Emperor was resorted to, meetings between committees of ten to offer and discuss possible modes of agreement. Isidore was one of the Greek delegates, and it is likely that he put forward as a possible formula of union the 'Through the Son', that had been used by the former Patriarch of Constantinople, Tarasius; he certainly prepared a dissertation along those lines. The Latins, however, were suspicious of 'Through', and did not take up the suggestion.

The conferences petered out without producing any tangible result, except that they led the Latins to present to the Greeks for their acceptance or comment a formal statement of Trinitarian faith. The Greeks were divided about it, and finally decided to produce a statement of their own, based on texts from St. Cyril and the first Council of Nicaea that Isidore had quoted in one of their meetings. But the Latins found that, too, ambiguous, and so union was still unachieved. Another month went by of visits of the Emperor to the Pope and of cardinals to the Emperor, of meetings among the Greeks and arguments and squabbles, till

on 27 May Eugenius addressed the Greek synod, recalling his high hopes of the previous year and his increasing sadness as time was frittered away and exhorting them to bring the blessed work of union of the Churches to a happy conclusion. The Pope's speech moved his hearers deeply, and Isidore spoke a few words in reply, pleading that the Greeks had not been inactive in a matter that needed much time and consideration.

The group of unionists was spurred on to renewed efforts, stressing always the necessary harmony of the saints and quoting the words about the Blessed Trinity of both Greek and Latin Fathers. Isidore with Bessarion and Dorotheus of Mitylene was always to the fore. The Emperor took votes from the prelates, and first (28 May) there was accepted the genuineness of the quotations made by Montenero from the Latin Fathers, which Eugenicus had senselessly challenged, and then (3 June), as an inevitable consequence, all the Greek prelates, led by the Patriarch, with the exception of only Eugenicus and three others, agreed that the Latin 'From the Son' meant the same as the traditional Greek 'Through the Son'.

Meantime the Emperor, seeing union now in the offing and mindful of one of his chief reasons for ever embarking on the enterprise of uniting the Churches, on 1 June sent Isidore to the Pope to discuss exactly what help His Holiness would furnish to Constantinople in its perpetual struggle against the Turk. Isidore brought back with him three cardinals, who gave satisfying assurances of generous aid. A few days later he was one of four delegates who twice spoke with the Pope about the other doctrinal questions that still had to be settled, and after the Patriarch's death (10 June), with Bessarion and Mitylene, he received the Pope's condolences and again discussed with him the outstanding problems. The doctrines of the primacy and the Eucharist were explained by Latin orators in public sessions, Isidore offering a compromise solution of the epiclesis difficulty, that John of Torquemada rejected. But the primacy of the pope was an obstacle that seemed to block the way to union, and there was general despair, Isidore, Bessarion and Mitylene with a few others rallied Emperor and Pope to further action. A meeting was arranged between committees of six, which included Isidore. Some concessions were made by the Pope. The Greeks, shortly after, acknowledged the papal primacy. Isidore with Mitylene visited the Pope to urge expedition; the Bull of union was drawn up and would have been promulgated on 29 June, if its wording had not caused difficulties. As it was the Greeks signed it on 5 July, Isidore doing so both as Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia and

as procurator of the Patriarch of Antioch. It is said that he imprisoned Bishop Avrami of Susdal for a week to make him sign.

The purpose for which the Russians and the Greeks were in Italy had now been fulfilled. They could go home and take the union with them. Isidore, on 17 August, was nominated by the Pope Apostolic Legate for Russia and the neighbouring territories, with the mission of establishing the union in all the area of his metropolitanate. In practice that meant persuading the kings and princes of Poland, Lithuania and the Russian principalities to accept it and to put it into effect, a difficult task because the tone of Poland and Lithuania was antipapal and pro-Basel, On 4 September Isidore was present at the solemn session of the council to promulgate the Bull, *Moyses vir Dei,* Eugenius's answer to Basel's decree of deposition against him, and on the same day, accompanied by Avrami of Susdal, he had a farewell audience of the Pope. He set out two days later and reached Venice on 15 September where, owing to the death of Albert of Hungary, he still was when in the consistory of 18 December Eugenius made him a cardinal. He left Venice only on 22 December, after some of his suite had lost patience and departed without him. Arrived in Buda on 5 March, he issued an encyclical letter explaining the union of Florence and its practical importance — identity of faith and equality of rites. In Poland he barely saw the King who was on the point of leaving for Hungary. Lithuania was very unsettled owing to the recent accession to power of a boy successor. Nevertheless he visited the more Ruthenian parts of those countries, being accepted everywhere as rightful Metropolitan. In Kiev, the historical cradle of his See, his rank was recognised and he was officially given its temporalities. He entered Moscow on 19 March 1441, taking with him the priest Symeon in chains for anti-unionist propaganda.

Metropolitan and papal Legate, he went in procession (behind, so it is said, a Latin cross) to the church of the Ascension, celebrated the Divine Liturgy in which at the appropriate place the Pope was prayed for, and, when the Liturgy was finished, he had the decree of union read aloud from the pulpit by the protodeacon clad in sacred vestments. Vasili accepted the letters that Eugenius had sent him by his Legate, but four days later he had Isidore arrested and confined in a monastery on a charge of heresy. Faced with the prospect of being tried by a committee formed from his own metropolitan synod (which included also Jonas, the unsuccessful rival for his See, and Avrami of Susdal), Isidore escaped to Tver, with, it is generally thought, the connivance of Vasili who desired nothing so much as to be rid of an influence that

breathed peace and co-operation with the Latins, when he wanted rather to undermine the loyalties of Ruthenian Christians in other countries and make them look to Moscow as their spiritual, and consequently also political, home. In Tver, Isidore was imprisoned again and, with his companion Gregory, the Greek monk, gained his liberty only on March 1442.

He found the tone of Poland and Lithuania less friendly than before, since in the meantime many bishops had declared themselves openly in favour of Basel against Eugenius. Nevertheless he lingered in those parts for a full year. Details of his activity are scarce, but it is certain that he visited many parts of the area subject to him as Metropolitan, smoothing out difficulties, settling problems and promoting the union of Florence on all occasions, as, for example, by consecrating unionist bishops for those dioceses that were vacant. One major result of his labours probably was the decree put out by Ladislas, King of Poland and Hungary, granting the Ruthenians equality of civil rights with the Latins. Unfortunately Ladislas's death in November 1444 robbed the decree of its force.

Isidore reached Venice in June 1443 and, on 11 July, Siena where the papal court then was, when he was invested with the insignia of a cardinal. At that time, the eve of a crusade against the Turks that ended so sadly at Varna, there was much coming and going on diplomatic missions. Isidore was soon involved in it. He left Italy towards the end of January 1444, sent by the Pope 'to Greece and Russia'. As far as is known, he spent the whole of the next four years, till 12 February 1448, in various parts of Greece, except for a short visit to Rome towards the end of 1445. He wrote several reports for the Pope of his observations, one of which, composed probably in the summer of 1451 apropos of a visit to Nicholas V of a Byzantine envoy, is still extant. In it he declared that the union was well established in all the Venetian colonies of the East and that in Constantinople, whereas there was a very small hard core of opponents — half a dozen and they were a kind of renegade in so far as they had either themselves signed the decree or agreed beforehand to the idea of a council of union —, there were, too, very many well disposed to it, especially in high places. The plan he suggested for strengthening union was the dispatch of trained preachers to explain simply, and as far as possible only from Greek sources, what the decree of union taught, and to send a legate first to the Peloponnese and then to Constantinople to recommend the union.

Nicholas V did send a legate, and it was Isidore. But by then the situation of Constantinople was almost desperate, for Maho-

met II had already cut the city off from the north by his new fort on the Bosphorus. The papal Legate left Rome on 20 May 1452, visited Naples, and accompanied by the Latin Bishop of Mitylene reached Constantinople on 26 October, bringing with him 200 archers from Chios, for whose hire he had sold his personal estate. George Scholarius, now the monk Gennadius, kept up a series of letters and manifestos to maintain opposition to the union, but the proximity of danger was too great. The ruling classes, throughout inclined towards union, needed little persuading. The populace, in general anti-unionist, was overawed by the circumstances. On 12 December 1452 at a solemn Liturgy in the church of S. Sophia the Pope was prayed for and commemorated in the diptychs, and the decree of union promulgated from the pulpit. On 29 May Constantinople fell to the victorious Turks, and the church of S. Sophia became a mosque.

Isidore had not brought to Constantinople archers from Chios for nothing. During the fifty-three days of the siege he fought with them in defence of the city and was wounded in the head, though fortunately not seriously, by a Turkish arrow. In the confusion of the capture of the city he was taken prisoner, was ransomed, managed to hide himself in disguise for a time, and finally escaped to Crete in one of the few ships that got away. From there he wrote anguished letters to Bessarion, the Pope and many others, lamenting the loss of 'that most hapless city', describing some of the atrocities committed by the Turkish soldiers, and warning Christendom that Mahomet had only just begun his career of conquest — Italy and Rome would be his next aim.

The days of Isidore's great activity were now over. For the future his life will be passed quietly in Rome. When he was first created cardinal, his titular church had been that of Sts Peter and Marcellinus. In February 1451 he became Bishop of Sabina, and on 24 January 1452, to give him the means of living reasonably according to his rank, on the death of Giovanni Cantareno, the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, to whom no successor was appointed, he was granted the enjoyment of the temporalities of that See, on condition that he appointed a vicar to do the work that belonged to it. In 1458 he co-operated in a scheme, that probably first originated from him, aiming at salving for union what could be salved of his metropolitanate of Russia. Jonas, the disappointed Russian candidate for the archbishopric in 1436, in 1448 was without reference to Constantinople elected and consecrated by the Russian synod Archbishop of Kiev and All Russia, and was recognised as such in 1451 by Casimir, King of Poland and Lithuania, in respect of his Ruthenian subjects. It was a

political move on Casimir's part, and it did not help him. He was, then, willing to fall in with the scheme, prepared by Callistus III and willing to fall in with the scheme, prepared by Callistus III and executed after Callistus's death by Pius II, of dividing the metropolitanate of Kiev and All Russia into two, the one part with its seat at Kiev comprising the nine oriental dioceses in Poland and Lithuania, the other with its seat at Moscow. To facilitate this plan Isidore resigned into the Pope's hands his archbishopric and, when Gregory the Greek monk, his old companion, was consecrated for Kiev, where the union was still lively, he became Archbishop of only Moscow. A year later (20 April 1459), on the death of Gregory III, he was appointed Patriarch of Constantinople, which meant in effect that he had practical jurisdiction in the Venetian colonies.

But Isidore was never reconciled to leaving Constantinople peaceably in the hands of the Turks. When Pius II at Mantua tried to rally the Christian princes of Europe to a grand crusade, Isidore immediately set to work to put it into practice and the winter of 1459-60 found him busy at Ancona preparing ships, buying arms, and collecting man and material for an 'expeditionary force'. He still had hopes, even when the negotiations of Mantua came to nothing, of leading his little band to the defence of the Peloponnese. But the Turks were there before him, and the only consolation he could then get was to welcome the Despot Thomas Palaeologus into exile.

On 1 April 1461 his health gave way and he became subject to a species of seizure. Yet he dragged himself (11 April 1462 from his sick bed to join the procession that was escorting the head of St. Andrew, the reputed founder of the Church of Constantinople, to St. Peter's, there to venerate it on his knees. He had always been poor and had kept up, for a cardinal, only a very modest household. Now his affairs became very involved, and the man whose career had been most like his own, the Greek Cardinal Bessarion, his very close friend, was appointed his administrator (13 December 1462). Isidore, the 'Ruthenian Cardinal', died on 23 April 1463.

Isidore has always had what nowadays is called a bad press. The Greeks consider him a traitor to Orthodoxy, some of them going so far as to suggest that the cardinal's hat was the bribe. The Russian chroniclers could not be expected to wax enthusiastic about him, and they did not do so. Even the Latin author of the 'Lives of Illustrious Men', Vespasiano da Bisticci, accused him of borrowing codices from the Vatican Library and failing to return them. More modern writers, like Pastor, have echoed the calumny. In consequence Isidore is now looked upon by most

of the few that know anything at all about him as having been ambitious, imprudent, and not quite honest; astute rather than intelligent; unscrupulous himself and impatient of hesitations in others; a man of little education, more given to activity than to reflection. His worst fault was that he failed.

There is no proof whatsoever that he was ambitious. Nothing at all is known of the circumstances that led to his being chosen as Metropolitan of Kiev, although it is generally thought that, as the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople were in favour of union of the Churches and a council to that end, they selected for Russia someone who, they knew, shared their views. In Italy he was one of those most active for union: he was made papal Legate for Russia — not unnaturally, as he was the Metropolitan of it and about to return there: he was created cardinal. These facts we know. To conclude to a nexus between them of ambition on the part of Isidore is completely unjustifiable. There is not the evidence.

The charge of imprudence is a deduction — since he failed to establish the union in Moscow, he must have been imprudent in the means he adopted and in particular in promulgating the decree immediately on his arrival. He had, however, written his encyclical letter of explanation and recommendation from Buda in 1440 and taken nearly another year to reach Moscow, having meanwhile found both his office and his message acceptable to the Christians of oriental rite wherever he went. Vasili must have been aware of all his movements and known of his success, and unquestionably he had determined on his own attitude before Isidore ever arrived. He was not going to have union, and the only conduct that would have secured Isidore peaceable possession of his See in Moscow would have been silence on what an oecumenical Council had established, what he had been commissioned to do and what he himself had most at heart. And that fact he learnt only after the event.

The imputation of dishonesty has been disproved at least twice. The registers of books borrowed in Isidore's time are still extant, and there is a catalogue of the Vatican Library of 1475. A comparison showed that, morally speaking, all the manuscripts that the Ruthenian Cardinal had borrowed had been returned. But other and more interesting facts also came to light in the course of the investigation, first that Isidore had enriched the Vatican Library, for it contains even now (after sacks of Rome, fire, and the negligence of human beings, many manuscripts that once were his, and also that he had a wide range of interests in his reading. His own books (some of them containing works of his own com-

position) and the books he borrowed (sometimes with notes of his added in the margins) cover many subjects: theology, patrology, philosophy, astronomy, mathematics etc. They show that Isidore was one of the group of Greek humanists that flourished in the first half of the XV century, and that he should be numbered as an equal with Bessarion, Scholarius, Mark Eugenicus and the rest.

His life-story is his best defence. He was sent by the Emperor and the Patriarch to Basel, made procurator for the Patriarchate of Jerusalem while still a simple monk, and chosen for the See of Kiev and All Russia. His fellows selected him as one of the six orators in Italy, a sign of their trust and an acknowledgement both of his learning and his powers of oratory. He was the trusted messenger of Emperor to Pope and of Pope to Emperor. He was twice papal Legate. He was one of Constantine's most reliable councillors during the siege of Constantinople, and he fought till the last defending its walls. A scholar, an orator, a writer, and yet a man of action indefatigable in his service of his religion and his country. The most bitter anti-unionists admired and liked him till he began to promote union. Syropoulos referred to him, on the occasion of his mission to Basel, as « that most worthy of abbots ». Mark Eugenicus, later Metropolitan of Ephesus, in a letter of congratulation to Isidore on his elevation to the throne of Kiev, wrote among many other high praises these words: « A man who really is a reflection of Christ, gracious in character and angelic in form; a happy and outstanding blend of simplicity and sagacity with a gift of speech that surpasses the flow of rivers; generous and liberal to such a degree as not to grudge even his own coverings, if occasion demand ».

J. Gill, S. J.

ANGLICANISM AND ESSENTIAL UNITY

In view of the vast quantity of literature, new and old, controversial and otherwise, which deals with the Anglican question, one is wise to tread in this field with a degree of circumspection. For one who is deeply devoted to the cause of Christian unity, the increased efforts during recent years towards mutual understanding between Catholics and separated Christians is a most encouraging sign. Without an awareness of the reasons why a thoughtful and conscientious non-Catholic remains outside the visible unity of the Church, the Catholic is ill-prepared to contribute to his return. And similarly, without an understanding of the Church's nature as constituting the Unity once established and preserved, the non-Catholic is far from the point of returning. While the joining of all within this unity is our ultimate goal, it can be attained only through an understanding based upon a respect for the other's integrity and a humble effort to communicate one's position in terms intelligible to the other. The problem of understanding is not of an entirely intellectual nature. It also involves a difference of ethos in the viewing of particular doctrines and of the events of history through different theological systems and modes of theological expression, under different standards of authority, and through separate traditions of practical religion. It thus becomes partially a problem of the communication of basic concepts; and this begins ultimately with concepts far more fundamental than those with which we shall be here concerned. I propose simply to set forth certain approaches to the Anglican question which I feel to be essential to its treatment.

It is important for Catholics to realize that a sizeable minority of Anglicans occupy a position of belief and practice very close to Catholicism. Although separated from the Church by a gulf of infinite depth as regards sacramental realities, their separation approaches the infinitesimal in its narrowness as regards the outward practice of religion and the spiritual life. While regarded by many of their co-religionists as « Romanizers » with aims subversive to the Anglican position itself, the « Anglo-Catholics » are wholly sincere in their promotion of Catholic beliefs and practices within their own communion, and submission to Rome is far from

their thoughts. It is their claim that the Church of England and her numerous daughter bodies form a « part » or « branch » of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church and that it thus shares a common heritage with Rome and Orthodoxy. The Anglo-Catholic contends that the Church of England which emerged from the Reformation is the same spiritual entity as the Catholic Church in England before, and that while many accidentals of the Faith were lost through Protestant influences the essentials of Catholicity were retained. The Roman Catholic has nothing, he believes, which he does not have, and what he seeks from Rome is the recognition of his claim. For this he is eternally hopeful and expectantly patient.

Position of influence

Since its beginnings in the Tractarian Movement of the 1830's Anglo-Catholicism has enjoyed a position of influence in the Anglican Communion far out of proportion to its numerical strength. It has effected a phenomenal growth of appreciation for Catholic beliefs and practices throughout the Anglican body and has caused an acceptance in some measure among Anglicans of all schools of thought of the claim for Anglican Catholicity which it has championed. The first aspect of this success can only be regarded as the work of the Holy Spirit, for through it Anglicans generally are in many ways closer to an understanding and appreciation of Catholicism than they were a century or even a generation ago, and the same may be said of many Protestants outside the Anglican body who have been influenced by Anglican thought. The second aspect, by which the first has been made possible, has occupied a central position in discussions between Catholics and Anglicans. Understandably it has been a point of extended controversy, for to both it is the key to the Anglican question. For a large proportion of Anglicans, and not only for those of « Anglo-Catholic » persuasion, the essential matter is to be within the Catholic Church as they conceive it.

In this view the Mystical Body of the faithful on earth is recognizable by its possession of the following notes or characteristics: the Apostolic Faith of Scriptures and Creeds; the Apostolic Order of the three-fold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons; the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion (to which many Anglicans would add the remaining five Catholic Sacraments); and historical, corporate continuity from Apostolic times interpreted in terms of a vertical line of descent. Christian bodies which possess these characteristics are believed to be parts of the Catholic

Church. Their communion one with another, while held to be desirable and in accord with the Will of God, is not held to be necessary for their essential Catholicity, and the present state of a « divided Catholicism » is held to be justified by circumstance. To the Anglican this position is wholly defensible both theologically and historically. Where he finds himself in divergence from Rome he claims to follow the authentic Apostolic faith and practice of an undivided Christendom of Patristic times. Upon his own premises this is indeed an unassailable position, and the first requisite for understanding is an awareness on the Catholic side as to the nature of the Anglican premises and the realization by Anglicans that their premises are neither those of the Catholic Church today nor of the Catholic Church in the early centuries.

It must be realized at the outset that a serious questioning of the validity of his orders rarely enters the mind of the Anglican. While the issue has been definitively settled for Catholics by the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* of Pope Leo XIII, Anglicans — even those in the process of conversion to Catholicism — are seldom moved by this consideration. For one whose spiritual life is rooted in Anglican sacraments and worship the subjective aspects of the matter simply outweigh the objective considerations. Furthermore, although all would admit its essential bearing upon the legitimacy of the Anglican position, the question of orders is viewed by Anglicans and can be fruitfully viewed by Catholics as being overshadowed by more critical issues. Few Anglicans indeed would long remain in their present position if they believed that regardless of the question of orders they stood in separation from the Holy Catholic Church. It is the nature of the Church as regards her essential unity and the nature of her spiritual jurisdiction which are the essential questions.

Presuppositions

We have noted above that the Anglican pre-supposes the possibility of a disunited Catholicism: that the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church in which we pledge our common faith in the creeds is capable of being divided by the will of man (or indeed of God) into separate communions. In defense of his position he leans heavily upon the precedent of the separated Orthodox bodies of the East which he regards as having equal claims to legitmacy as Rome. Indeed, many Anglicans would assert that Rome has propounded a false doctrine of the Church and has therefore fallen into heresy and is herself the schismatic body. A small minority of Anglicans hold strongly papalist views, but most deny any sug-

gestion that Rome is by divine right the source and centre of unity for Christendom. To them, visible unity, while desirable and to be earnestly sought, is not a necessary note of the Church nor manifestation of her being. Oneness is instead conceived of as an exclusively spiritual quality expressed through the sacramental office of the episcopate which provides a unity of life in Christ although outward divisions may exist. This is to say that the Church as a supernatural organism is not to be identified with the Church as a visible organization. Relating to this, a distinction is frequently made in Anglican theology between « objective » and « subjective » unity, the former denoting an inward union of separated Catholic communions through a common sacramental participation in the life and merits of the one Christ, and the latter denoting external unity by a *communio in sacris*. A similar and not unrelated distinction is drawn between a « vertical » and a « horizontal » unity, or the unity in Christ of the Church Militant with the Church Expectant and the Church Trimphant as distinct from and overshadowing the visible unity (or disunity) of the Church Militant within itself.

Radical departure

While built upon the foundation of Catholic doctrines the Anglican premise entails a radical departure from them. It denies the essential, mutual inter-dependence of the notes of Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity of the Church and constitutes a repudiation of her sacramental nature as a visible, external expression of the supernatural union of the faithful in the Incarnate Son and of the eternal union of the Son with the Father. While it is beyond the scope of the present article, it is also clear that this disbalanced ecclesiology has its roots in an unbalanced Christology. The Anglican appeal is to history, to Holy Scripture, and to the doctrine of the Fathers, and it is by these approaches that Anglicans may best be guided to new understanding of Catholic truth. For the Fathers, as in Catholic theology today, visible, external unity is an essential note of the Church and a sacramental sign of the inward unity of all who are united in Christ by the bond of charity which is of the Holy Ghost: a sacramental manifestation of the Kingdom of God. The universality of this doctrine and the explicit nature of its expression imposes a grave burden of proof upon those who would deny it. It has firm roots in Holy Scripture and has been axiomatic in Catholic theology in all ages. Although stated in different terms, it has also been held by Orthodoxy up to the present day. The Anglican answer

would be that the theoretical has seldom been realized in practice and that the exact relation of schism to the Church has never been fully defined. But this is to beg the question. Whatever leniencies the Church has observed and concessions to schism she has made have been prompted by the same Spirit of charity in which the bond of unity consists. The Catholic doctrine of essential unity is not one of two or more theories of the oneness of the Church, but is a fundamental expression of her nature according to revealed truth. To argue, as is frequently done by Anglicans, that if the Fathers had lived in an age of extensive division such as ours they would have met the new circumstances with new theories, is again to side-step the issue and to deny the explicit and harmonious teaching of Scripture and Tradition. The Fathers themselves were motivated not by a desire to explain unity, but to deal with the fact of existent schism and to show it to be contradictory to the nature of the Church. Again, as so frequently, we are drawn to the prayer of our Lord to the Father on behalf of those who were to form the nascent Church: « Ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu, Pater, in me, et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint, ut credat mundus quia tu me misisti ». It is intended indeed to apply in all ages for all who are in Him, but it cannot be interpreted as being unrelated to the essential nature of the Church which was to continue the life and mission of the Incarnate Son. Its sequence with the after Supper discourse to the Apostolic nucleus shows its particular application to them and its initial fulfillment in the unity which they were to embody after the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. This unity is in fact so organic and intrinsic that it is stated by our Lord to be the effective sign of His Mission from the Father. Thus the external unity of the Church, of its members one with another in the Father through the Son, is identical in type with the unity between the Son and the Father. The Anglican claim is a simple denial of Catholic truth. To find precedent for the denial is not to excuse or justify it, and the fact must be faced that the concept of a divided Catholic Church is, at least on a practical working basis, the unique product of Anglican apologists.

Divine foundation

The unity thus essential to the nature of the Church by divine foundation is also by the same authority centred in the See of Peter. The Anglican rationale for separation from communion with the Holy See is largely founded upon a misconception of the relationship between Rome and the Universal Church. In an over-

all picture of the position of Rome throughout the history of the Church, Anglicans are often times ready to admit a grandeur, a fidelity to truth, and an influence which defies human reason, but at the same time the development of the exercise of her authority is most frequently attributed to natural causes: a human desire for power and the fortuitous circumstances of the episcopate in the imperial city of a decaying empire. Many Anglicans also would readily acknowledge the primacy of Peter among the Apostles and the reality of the succession to this primacy by those who have followed him in his own Apostolic See. Again, however, its nature is held by most to be that of a simple presidency over the Apostolic episcopate without reference to the supreme teaching authority and ultimate source of spiritual jurisdiction upon which the essential unity of the Church is founded. The Anglican views the papal office as an extra which has been added into the divinely ordained episcopal constitution of the Church rather than, as St. Cyprian expresses it, the apex or source of the constitution itself, « unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est » (*Ep.* lix. 14). The Anglican interpretation not only leaves the Petrine texts in Scripture devoid of meaning in terms of their historical exegesis but fails to take into account the place of Patristic teaching relating to the Holy See in context with the ecclesiology of the age in which it was given. The papal office and its prerogatives cannot be viewed apart from the Church universal, to which inerrancy of faith and integrity of jurisdiction appertain.

The Anglican viewpoint is based largely upon an argument from silence. If our Lord intended that the See of Peter was to occupy the position which it claims, why, we are asked, did He not state this explicitly? If the Fathers attributed the claimed prerogatives to Rome why is their teaching not more clear? The argument from silence is a dangerous one, for upon the same premise a denial of equal force may be directed against other facets of the faith and life of the Church which Anglicans would be as zealous to defend as Catholics; and it overlooks the force and authority of a divinely guided Tradition, upon which the scriptural evidence itself is ultimately dependent. But this argument may be turned even more forcefully the other way. Why, we may ask, if the prerogatives of the Holy See as set forth in the writings of a considerable number of the Fathers had been viewed as false by the early Church as a whole, was not this teaching quickly and forcefully repudiated? It is inconceivable that such a matter would have been allowed to pass in silence, but we find not a shred of evidence for the attempted repudiation of the prerogatives of the Holy See as then set forth. Instead, we find a steady and growing appre-

ciation in the mind of the Church as to the extent and nature of the Roman primacy. And this is the essential point. The exercise of the papal office developed not as a product of secular forces and historical circumstance but as the expression of one facet of the Church's growing awareness of her own nature. By reading back into the mind of the early centuries the later expressed complexities of the same doctrine, the issues become obscured and the force of Patristic testimony is lost. Rather than arguing from what the early Fathers did not say, one may well mark the profound significance of what they did say in the context of their own age. In the second and third centuries St. Ignatius, St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian approach the question quite simply: Rome is the See of Peter and for this reason is the primatial see of Christendom, the preeminent possessor of the Apostolic Tradition, and the centre of unity. These same truths were subsequently proclaimed more explicitly by St. Jerome, St. Optatus, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, among others, and by the councils of Sardica, Aquileia, and Chalcedon: the same truths indeed which have become yet more fully expressed and defined in later centuries. In all areas of revealed truth contained in the Apostolic deposit of Faith, expression and definition by the Church has corresponded to the need for the truths to be defined in the face of error or to be asserted to meet the circumstances of her life in successive ages. To this the prerogatives of the Holy See provide no exception, and as seen in this light may perhaps become more understandable to those who do not accept them.

Nature and transmission of spiritual jurisdiction

In a rapid survey such as this, one can provide no more than a surface treatment of the issues under consideration and can lay no claim to an original contribution in a field of long standing discussion. It has been my purpose to outline an approach to one facet of the Anglican position which I believe to be of primary importance and to which both Anglicans and Catholics should give deep consideration. The question of the nature and transmission of spiritual jurisdiction, which is of course closely related to the present topic, I believe to be of equal importance and to have essential bearing upon the circumstances of the English Reformation. Although I may have appeared to become polemical at points, this has not been my intention. My aim has been simply to further charitable understanding in accordance with the desires of the Holy Father.

HAMILTON HESS

THE CENTENARY OF A MEMORABLE RUSSIAN PRIEST FATHER GREGORY SCHUVALOFF

One hundred years ago Father Gregory Schuvaloff of the Barnabite Fathers consummated the oblation of his life for the sake of Christian unity. He was a figure who commands our admiration and gratitude; thus, we can hardly do less than review the spiritual journey, with its vicissitudes and triumphs, which led him to the attainment of genuine happiness. It is, in fact, of 'happiness' that he speaks in the last part of his autobiography which he wrote under the title of *Ma Conversion et Ma Vocation.* One might say that he had composed a hymn of thanksgiving and at the same time drawn a guide for all those souls who cannot be at rest until they have attained the truth in all its integrity.

Gregory Petrovitch Schuvaloff was born on April 25, 1804, at St. Petersburg. His family enjoyed a position of highest distinction in the Russian aristocracy of the time. His father, a general in the Imperial Army, had made the campaign of 1814 with the armies of the nations allied against Napoleon, and the charge of conducting Napoleon to the Island of Elba was eventually entrusted to him. At this time, little Gregory was a pupil in the Jesuit college at St. Petersburg. After the closing of this school and the death of his father, he was sent to the Pellemberg Institute at Hoffwill, near Berne, in Switzerland. This was a school for young noblemen where the sons of Europe's great families were trained in the code of honor. Young Gregory was, nevertheless, influenced here by the agnosticism then à la mode; and, moreover, an extended stay in Italy was to be the occasion of his indulging in many of the pleasures of the world.

When Count Schuvaloff returned to Russia in 1832, he was given the rank of Captain of the Hussar Guard and was flattered and idolized in the capital's brilliant salons. Here he met Sophie Saltikoff, and in a very short time married her. Besides being an affectionate mother to the three children who were subsequently born to them, she was also his good angel, for it was she who led him back to God.

In time the Countess became ill, and her protracted illness and consequent death obliged her devoted husband to make frequent vis-

its to France and Italy. Moreover, as she had died a Catholic, the grief in his soul was mingled with the anguish precipitated by an acute religious problem — all the more so, because having become a convert at Rome, his young wife had offered herself as victim for his return to the true Church. At first, Schuvaloff hesitated; but as he gave himself over to study and meditation on the Gospel, the faith of his childhood was reawakened, and a taste for things of the spirit was enkindled within him.

In returning to God and relearning his Christianity, Schuvaloff turned first to the faith of his ancestors — the religion of his holy Russia. Repenting of his past, he went to an Orthodox priest and received from him the Sacrament of Penance. He was fully resolved to remain with the faith of his people and deliberately suppressed any feelings of attraction toward the Roman Church.

The Catholics who were among his friends and acquaintances conducted themselves with respect for his convictions, and were careful to avoid indiscreet proselytizing. At this period in his life Schuvaloff followed a series of Lenten sermons given by the Jesuit, Father Minini. At its conclusion, he called upon him to discuss the spiritual quandary which disturbed him. The good father simply gave the counsel: « First enter the house; and then, when you are in, choose the room ». This priest had doubtless sensed that Schuvaloff, in deepening his piety, would of himself come upon the door leading to the fullness of his faith.

Having returned to a pious life, he found himself assailed by questions aroused by the phenomenon of varying religious beliefs within Christianity, and he was perplexed by the fact of divisions separating Christian bodies. He did not allow himself to be shaken by this scandal, but patiently pursued his quest for integral truth, which, he realized, could only be the fruit of utter sincerity, and patient prayer.

Schuvaloff studied the Orthodox faith more closely. He was repelled by what he felt to be a tendency of the national churches to be subservient to the power of the state. Protestantism attracted him for a while because it seemed to favor a freer exercise of reason. He decided thereupon to make a closer, personal investigation, and went to Berlin for the purpose. But the religion he found in the Protestant churches failed to satisfy him. This could well be expected for an individual whose religious sentiments had been formed in the warmth and splendor of the Eastern Eucharistic Liturgies. Surprising as it may seem, it was here in the heart of Lutheranism that he began to feel the need of making contact with the Catholic Church.

Returning to Paris, he proceeded to study the Catholic faith. This he did with painstaking thoroughness. During Lent of 1842, he attended the Lenten sermons of Fr. de Ravignan. He was deeply impressed by this famous Jesuit and formed a close friendship with him. As his studies progressed, his mind opened upon new and ever larger horizons. When they were terminated, he made a decision to discard anything of the past that might interfere with a loyal response to the voice of God within Him — and his past was rich with things that were dear to him. The Orthodox world had never ceased to be the fatherland of his heart, and it was there that his human preferences remained. Finally, on the sixth of January, 1843, in the chapel of the Couvent des Oiseaux at Paris, he made his profession of faith in the presence of Prince Galitzin and Mme. Swetchine. From thence forward he was constantly aware that his immense sacrifice had brought him peace of mind and heart.

Despite the demands that the careful education of his children made upon him, Schuvaloff did not permit his concern for his spiritual progress to diminish. Nor did his concern for spiritual things hinder him from rendering his duties to the state. Thus, in 1845 he accompanied the Russian sovereigns on a trip to Italy, where his devotion found an outlet in works of mercy. In 1849 we find him at the bedside of the soldiers wounded at the siege of Rome. Again at Paris, he spent himself so generously in caring for the sick in the hospitals that he earned the name « Sister of Charity ». The message of the evangelical counsels became deeply imbued in his soul. When he was again recalled to Russia by Czar Nicholas I, he found himself painfully ill at ease in the luxurious life of the court. It was only in 1856, however, that he succeeded in making a complete break with it.

A little later we find him at the Barnabite Noviciate at Monza in Italy, where he had sought entrance to the religious life. Evidentally, something profound had stirred in the depths of his soul. He tells us that « the complete transformation came about by virtue of the Sacraments, which at last had been rediscovered and practiced ». He furnishes no further confidences than this on the matter; it is, however, sufficient explanation of his decision. The Holy Eucharist had supplied the strength he needed to give himself totally to God.

In the noviciate he learned how to love better both the Church and his dear Russia, and this in an atmosphere of fervor for unity.

When he had made his religious profession, Schuvaloff proceeded to Rome, and there received the sub-diaconate in the Basilica of St. John Lateran. On September 18, 1857, at Milan, he was

ordained to the priesthood, and very shortly afterwards was appointed to the Barnabite house at Paris.

Before departing for his new assignment, he was received in audience by Pope Pius IX, who in the course of the conversation made a singular request of him — that he consecrate himself to the cause of Christian unity.

« Most Holy Father », responded Fr. Schuvaloff, « I am ready, from this moment on, to make of my life a sacrifice for the conversion of my compatriots ».

« It is well », the Pope answered, « it is well. Repeat this avowal three times daily before the Crucifix ... and your desires will be fulfilled ».

Fr. Schuvaloff had not long to wait before obtaining the grace he had asked. At the beginning of the year 1859 he began to suffer the illness which was to take away his life and place a seal upon the sacrifice which he had offered to God for the salvation of Russia. In these last months of his earthly existence, he had never ceased to renew the oblation of his life three times daily before the Blessed Sacrament for the return of his country to Unity. He had multiplied his apostolic works and his sermons for Unity. Often he would limit his appeal to these three words: « Pray for Russia ». This is a call which is always heard by those who join their prayers with the priestly prayer of Our Lord Jesus Christ for the unity of all His followers.

JEROME CORNÉLIUS, A. A.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

A Papal letter commending the octave of prayer

The following is the text of an autograph letter from His Holiness, Pope John XXIII, to the Very Reverend Angelus Delahunt, Superior General of the Society of the Atonement, the Franciscan community founded by Father Paul Wattson, originator of the January Octave of Prayer for unity. Bearing the date of October 28, the anniversary of Pope John's election as Supreme Pontiff, the letter warmly commends this annual period of prayer which assumes an even greater significance in view of the next Ecumenical Council.

To Our beloved son Angelus Delahunt, Superior General of the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement:

The tender emotion which filled the Sacred Heart of Jesus when He saw the multitudes, « and had compassion on them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd » (Mark vi, 34), cannot but permeate the soul of His Vicar on earth, as We contemplate the great numbers to whom the Good News has not yet been preached, or especially those who are unhappily separated from communion with this Holy See and the Chair of Peter, center of unity in belief and love.

Like the Divine Saviour, the Successor of Peter may exclaim: « Other sheep I have that are not of this fold. Them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice » (John x, 16). Indeed, Our illustrious Predecessors and We Ourselves have frequently addressed loving appeals to Our separated brethren, inviting them affectionately to return to their Father's House, that the Redeemer's prayer may be fulfilled: « and there shall be one Fold, and one Shepherd » (John x, 16).

Prayer, in fact, is the first and principal means to be used to bring about this yearned-for unity, as your beloved Founder, Father Paul Wattson, so clearly saw; and he therefore promoted the Chair of Unity Octave, during which fervent supplications should be raised to the Almighty for the return of all to the one true Faith.

We gladly make Our own the words of Our immediate Predecessor of happy memory, Pope Pius XII, by expressing the prayerful wish that this practice « be spread everywhere in the world as widely as possible », especially in view of the forthcoming General Council, during which it is hoped that our separated brethren will be copiously illuminated and strengthened by the Divine Comforter. As We wrote in Our Encyclical Letter « Ad Petri Cathedram », the Council « will surely be a wonderful manifestation of truth, unity, and charity; a manifestation, indeed, which it is Our hope that those who behold it, but who are separated from this Apostolic See, will receive as a gentle invitation to seek and find that unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His heavenly Father » (June 29, 1959).

Encouraging you and your community to ever more strenuous efforts in the propagation of the Chair of Unity Octave, We urgently invite the faithful of every race and clime to join in this period of prayer; and in pledge of copious heavenly graces and favors upon all participating therein, as well as upon those for whom they pray, We cordially impart to you, beloved son, to the members of your Congregation, to the associates of your League of Prayer, and to all those taking part in the Chair of Unity Octave, Our paternal and affectionate Apostolic Benediction.

From the Vatican, October 28, 1959. PP. Joannes XXIII.

* * *

Possibilities of reunion as seen by two prelates of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches

The possibilities of reunion between Catholics and Orthodox are reflected in the following abridged account of recent addresses by two well-known prelates of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches in the United States, Bishop John J. Wright of Pittsburgh and Archbishop Anthony Bashir, spiritual leader of the Syrian Orthodox Church in North America.

The points brought out by the speakers on the occasion referred to below suggest that a rapprochement *is quite possible between Catholics and Orthodox and that it can be brought about by prayer and good will.*

The summary of these two addresses is based upon a report of the news section of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington.

Some elements of a « common heritage » which Catholics and Orthodox Christians share were singled out by Bishop John J. Wright of Pittsburgh in a talk in the parish hall of St. George Syrian Orthodox Church in Pittsburgh early in November. Parishioners of the church had invited Bishop Wright to attend an anniversary dinner and to share the speakers' platform with their metropolitan, Archbishop Anthony Bashir.

The parish committee had asked both the Catholic and Orthodox prelates to center their remarks around the prospect of the reunion of Christians, particularly of Catholics and Orthodox; with special reference to His Holiness, Pope John XXIII's announcement of an ecumenical council.

Bishop Wright pointed out in his address that, even though for historic and extremely important reasons, Catholics cannot worship together with the Orthodox, they have strong ties of friendship, sympathy, and even faith with their Orthodox neighbors.

« We have in common many anxieties about evils which menace both our traditions most especially », he declared. « The threat of world atheism is a source of particular dread to our respective peoples, greater dread, perhaps, than to others who, though believers, do not always share our understanding concerning the sovereignty and the transcendent claims of God on every level of our lives.

« We have a common ground for rejecting materialism and for fearing its spread », he continued, « since, whatever our differences, we more than most have clung to the concepts of the supernatural, the sacramental and the spiritual in the vivid sense that the Fathers of the Church understood these. World communism, combining the threats of atheism and materialism, shocks us more than it is likely to shock those who have somehow found more tolerable, in some areas of thought at least, the secularism, indifferentism, and religious liberalism which our traditions uncompromisingly reject. Incidentally, communism has taken its most tragic tolls among Catholic and Orthodox peoples, which should also give us a closer sympathy and desire for unity ».

Bishop Wright commented that « on the level of theology we have other things in common; both our traditions abhor the concept of heresy. Other peoples, even good peoples, have come to look upon heresy as a kind of right. Large areas, even of the Christian world, far from sharing our fear of heresy, even think of heresy as a manifestation of intellectual freedom. This has never been characteristic of our traditions; we have believed, both of us, in freedom and our peoples have traditionally fought for it passionately in their political and cultural histories. But when it came to

theology, to the interpretation and acceptance of the revelations made by and about Jesus Christ and His Gospel, we have wished only the freedom of the sons of God and have recognized that this freedom does not permit us to tamper by heresy or private interpretation with the Faith delivered to the Fathers ».

The Bishop added that « we have ancient and holy memories which we still share and these give us common grounds for future hopes which other Christians may often only hardly understand. We share the memories of countless saints of apostolic and ancient Christendom. We share in great degree doctrine concerning veneration for the Blessed Mother, especially as Mother of God, which appears unacceptable, even unintelligible to others.

« Our common heritage includes apostolic persons, apostolic places, apostolic doctrines, the appreciation of and attachment to apostolic succession. We both understand the concept of hierarchy and the public liturgical life which Jesus intended the Church to have. We may not always agree as to what Peter did or Paul taught, but we would never wish to be found outside the tradition of which Peter, Paul, and the other Apostles are, for all our peoples, the divinely-empowered teachers.

« Sad history, some it political, all of it unfortunate, has caused grave divisions between us. It is not our place to discuss these here, but the divisions are very real. As a result of them, there are good and solid reasons, arising out of the fundamental necessity for the scrupulous protection of the Faith, why we do not pray the Liturgy together and why I and my people cannot join in your public prayers. But important and unescapable, given the historic divisions, as are prohibitions against common cult and joining in liturgical prayer, we both understand what the Liturgy is and we can and do pray for the same things ».

The Bishop noted that « this latter fact is far more important than either of us sometimes appreciates. At least we are not praying against one another. Our situation does not parallel that scandal in political society which finds believers in the pathetic situation, when war breaks out, of praying against one another.

« Even in the world of religion, men who disagree violently and deeply as to what is God's will are in the tragic position of praying against one another, at least in some degree. But we can, in consoling degree, pray for one another in the confidence that, more than other Christians can appreciate, we though praying separately because of historic reasons, are praying for many identical things when we pray for the freedom and exaltation of the Church.

« When we repeat the Our Father », Bishop Wright stated, « we pray in common with millions who are neither Catholic nor Ortho-

dox; all this is good. But when we repeat the Apostles' Creed, we share a prayer which proclaims doctrine which means almost everything to our two groups and which we share with increasingly few Christians outside our groups.

« When we pray for increase of Faith, we mean something quite different from what our brethren burdened by the multiple heresies of divided Christendom mean. The very concept of Faith, the virtue, nature, and content of Faith are necessarily different for those who have come to terms with Modernism in theology ».

« That is why », continued Bishop Wright, with full confidence I can ask, as I do ask, that you pray for His Holiness the Pope and for his intentions, knowing that these intentions included so many of the things for which your Liturgy prompts you to pray and which we, if only because of our common apostolic memories, cherish together.

« No one can say when or how the Holy Father's prayers for a united profession of Apostolic Faith will be realized, at least between the Catholic Church and those Churches in the East which are no longer in communion with Rome. We certainly cannot set a time schedule in a matter so locked in the problems of history and the providence of God.

« Some Churches of the East have remained in union with Rome », the Bishop recalled. « Their enduring and diverse liturgical traditions may perhaps bear witness to what may yet be the varied but united pattern of things to come if East and West can study and pray themselves closer together. In any case, on every side those who believe that the hope of the future must be based on the Apostolic Faith of the past can and must practice, day by day, that charity, revealing itself in the friendliness, forbearance, and sympathy which, at the end as in the beginning, must be the soul of Christian unity ».

Archbishop Bashir declared in his address that there were many people « on all sides » who were actually hostile or indifferent to Pope John's hopes, and he confessed a suspicion that many Catholics failed to share the optimism of the Pope. The Archbishop remarked that many Orthodox had reacted adversely to his own enthusiastic declarations about the Holy Father's ecumenical appeals, and added that he had even been accused of being « underpressured from Rome ».

But Archbishop Bashir insisted that he had always felt that there were no hopes whatever for Christian reunion unless first the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Churches, both jealously attached to the doctrine of apostolic succession, would come to some understanding. He said that Orthodox theologians and

prelates would have no difficulty acknowledging a « primacy of honor » as belonging to the Bishop of Rome, and even hoped that other difficulties could be cleared up. Many Orthodox would welcome the appointment by the Pope, as the primate of all Patriarchs, of a commission to study how theologians and spokesmen for Catholicism and Orthodoxy might best meet, he declared.

Archbishop Bashir lamented what he termed « unrepresentative » Orthodox statements that the Orthodox should not meet with Catholic theologians unless Protestants also participated. He said that the differences in faith and theology between the Protestants generally and those who claim apostolic succession and accept the ancient ecumenical councils were too complex to be faced until the Catholics and the Orthodox had set a pattern of agreement.

Many of the differences between Catholicism and Orthodoxy he considered matters of « definition », claiming that Catholics had explicitly defined many truths which the Orthodox implicitly believed.

As an example, Archbishop Bashir cited the doctrine of Purgatory, saying that Catholics pray for the dead and explain explicitly that the dead are influenced by these prayers because they are in Purgatory. The Orthodox, he continued, pray for the dead, just as do the Catholics, both privately and in their Liturgy, and obviously assume by doing so a state of the dead like to Purgatory, even if they have not explicitly defined the doctrine.

Archbishop Bashir pointed out how many of the difficulties between East and West were matters of semantics and translations, occasionally translations of Scripture and sometimes translations of the Church Fathers. These differences were paralleled, he added, in political history by misunderstandings between Eastern and Western nations as to the precise meanings of words in treaties and statements of law.

* * *

An Anglican commentary on the north Indian plan of reunion

As the readers of Unitas *will remember, one of the key issues of the Lambeth Conference in* 1958 *was that which dealt with the current reunion schemes involving members of the Anglican Communion. Already Convocations (the highest authority in the Anglican Church) had granted recognition to the Orders of the Church*

of South India in 1955, and had approved an extensive intercommunion with that body. This approval was reiterated at the last Lambeth Conference, and the Anglican bishops in attendance gave, as well, an overwhelming approbation to two other schemes of union now in process: that of North India/Pakistan and that of Ceylon. This latter vote of confidence by the Lambeth bishops came in for a good deal of questioning by those in the Anglican Communion who recognized the complex nature of the negotiations for unification and who felt that the bishops had given too little consideration to the doctrinal implications of the schemes in question.

A reflection of these misgivings can be seen from the latest circular letter to the associates of the Anglican Church Union from its secretary, the Rev. F. P. Coleman. We are quoting the greater part of his letter which deals in detail with the North Indian Plan to show the necessity of dealing with divisive issues at the deepest level and how, in the ultimate analysis, the only hope of effective unity is one that is based on genuine doctrinal agreement.

« ... Both the fact of disunity and the movement towards unity have their impact upon almost every diocese in the Church, and the provinces of the Anglican Communion are called upon to make decisions, whether or no they are faced with domestic problems in this field. For instance, the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon wishes to know the reaction of other parts of our communion to the proposals for reunion in North India/Pakistan and Ceylon. The greater part of a year has elapsed since the Lambeth Conference published its conclusions on the Plan and Scheme for Church Union in these areas, and theological discussion which has continued during the intervening period makes it increasingly clear that these conclusions do not provide a safe guide to the Provincial Synods and other bodies which will have these reunion projects before them for discussion in due course. So far as the Church Union is concerned, little has been published by way of public comment either on these reunion plans or on the findings of the Lambeth Conference. The theological problems involved are of a very intricate nature, and public campaigns always lead to over-simplification, as well as to an unhealthy stimulation of emotion, which may cloud judgment, give rise to doubt and uncertainty, and so impede the spiritual life of the Church at large. On the other hand, the quiet discussions of a body like the Church Union's Theological Committee are more likely to lead to a true assessment of what is proposed, commanding correspondingly greater respect.

I cannot examine two schemes of reunion in detail within the compass of one letter, but I want to put before you some of the major points we have had in mind. So far as North India is concerned, we notice that the Plan had not begun to take shape at the time of the Lambeth Conference, 1948. The South Indian project took much longer to formulate, and although later discussions have benefitted by what has gone before, the North Indian Plan raises many problems which demand much more thorough discussion. It may be that the Negotiating Committee felt itself obliged to produce something for the recent Lambeth Conference to discuss, and was anxious to avoid a delay of ten years. Yet such a delay might have led to a plan which was universally acceptable, though I greatly doubt this in view of the reception given to some of the Lambeth proposals in nonconformist circles.

The North Indian Plan seeks to embrace a wide variety of Christian traditions, with a correspondingly great diversity of belief and practice. It includes Presbyterians with a strong sense of their doctrinal position, episcopal Methodists, Baptists who have firm beliefs about the Church and about Holy Baptism, and such bodies as the Church of the Brethren who do not regard themselves as bound by creeds. Among the negotiating bodies, Anglicans find themselves in a small minority, not more than 20 % of the whole. Their strength seems to be concentrated in one or two principal areas, so that their impact upon other traditions is correspondingly restricted. One cannot help asking how Catholic essentials, preserved in the Anglican Communion, are likely to fare in a « united church » with such a preponderance of Protestant influence. Optimism might be justified if the Plan itself provided adequate guarantees for Catholic faith and practice. In fact, there are so many uncertainties on matters of principle that a gloomy view seems inevitable. Unfortunately, all this is obscured by the equivocal tribute in the Lambeth Report, 1958, to the orthodoxy of the doctrinal statements set out in the Plan. So far as they go, the statements made in the section entitled The Doctrines of the Church are indeed orthodox, but positive assertions about the faith occupy less than half a page. The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds are accepted as witnessing to and guarding the faith, but no provision is made for their use either at the Baptism service or as a basis of instruction. A former Baptist missionary told me that many Baptists in India would never have heard of either creed, though they may have been taught the doctrines outlined in them.

It could be said hopefully that all the bodies entering the Union will in course of time use the creeds and teach their doc-

trine. Against this we must set the provision for the continued use of any confessional statements of faith, authoritative in any of the uniting bodies at the time of union. Under this heading the United Church have submitted a whole list of Protestant confessions of the Reformation period. They have found in South India that people change very slowly. Is it likely that a great Protestant majority in North India will show itself more ready to abandon traditions of belief and teaching so firmly rooted? Incidentally, we may wonder what meaning is attached to « unity » when such variety of belief is encouraged. It is said that this particular provision had to be inserted to ensure the legal continuity of the uniting bodies and to preserve them from litigation over property. Indian propensity for legal action is well known, but the faith of the Church ought not to be bartered in this way.

The Lambeth Conference had some doubts about the acceptance in the Plan of Baptism by sprinkling. They were not, apparently, concerned about the position of the Baptists in the proposed union. The Baptists themselves clearly have had misgivings, as may be seen from an Appendix containing a Declaration of Principle of the Baptist Churches. Here it is stated that Infant Baptism is contrary to Baptist conviction, though the participating Baptists are willing to tolerate its administration by others. This is a serious division of belief about fundamentals in a « united church ». The Plan notes the difficulty which may arise if a person baptised in infancy desires Believers Baptism. He may be referred to the Bishop for advice and direction, and although the Appendix which covers this question asserts Baptism to be unrepeatable, Baptist commentators have said that the reference of difficult cases to the Bishop is meaningless unless it provides for the administration of Believer's Baptism to one baptized in infancy. It may be noted in passing that the *effectual* character of Baptism is not clearly brought out though this may be covered by a general statement about sacraments « as means of grace by which we are united to God ».

As to Holy Communion, almost nothing is said in regard to the sacrament itself. Some good theology is implied in the list of points to be included in the Holy Communion Service, but the Plan contains no statement in any way comparable to what is taught in the Prayer Book Catechism. It seems that no particular belief about Holy Communion as a sacrament will be required of those who join the proposed united church. As might be expected, nothing is said about the use of unfermented wine, nor of the disposal of what remains of the consecrated elements.

I have mentioned the foregoing points before considering pro-

blems relating to the ministry largely because they have not been given proper weight in official pronouncements. At the same time, the proposals regarding the ministry in the united church are so unsatisfactory that they do call for special consideration. You will remember that when the Church of South India was inaugurated, it was decided that all future candidates for the ministry should receive episcopal ordination, but that all ministers of the uniting churches should be given equal recognition. This meant that former nonconformist ministers would work on equality with Anglican priests, celebrating Holy Communion and performing other functions peculiar to the priesthood. The Lambeth Conference which met in the following year, 1948, urged that in future schemes for union, the ministries of the uniting bodies should be united at or soon after the inauguration of the new « united church ». The North Indian Negotiating Committee accepted this proposal, and have certainly tried hard to produce a form of unification which will produce a ministry acceptable as far as possible to the Church at large and episcopal in character.

Unfortunately, the assumptions upon which they base their form of unification seems to make the realisation of this aim impossible. Roughly the procedure to be followed works out in this way. First there is to be a service of inauguration, establishing the Union. Then, since episcopal Methodists are involved, there is to be a bringing together of the episcopates (though, of course, the Methodists are « bishops » only in title). The next stage is the Representative Act of Unification of the Ministry, at which it is aimed that all the ministries concerned should be brought together. This is to be followed later by Diocesan Services of Unification.

In the Plan, the bringing together of episcopates is effected through the mutual laying-on of hands by the former Anglican bishops and those bearing this title in the Methodist Church in Southern Asia, but these bishops are also required to undergo a further imposition of hands in the Representative Act of Unification. The Lambeth Conference suggested amendments to the prayer and formula to be used at the bringing together, and proposed that hands should not be laid on bishops in the Representative Act. Nonconformist bodies taking part in the negotiations have reacted sharply to this proposal. They clearly regard the bringing together of the episcopates as something incidental. What matters to them is the Representative Act of Unification, since they do not wish the bishops to have a separate unification which will suggest the division of the ministry into episcopal and other orders. Presbyterians have objected that to separate the bishops would

be to equate a Presbyterian minister with an Anglican priest, whereas they regard him as the equal of a bishop!

At the representative Act of Unification there will be delegations from all the uniting bodies. They will include the bishops of the united church, the presbyters designated to be bishops, and groups of presbyters so chosen that each diocese is represented by at least one presbyter. First, one representative minister from each of the uniting bodies will lay hands on three others chosen beforehand, one of them a bishop, with the words:

« Forasmuch as thou wast called and ordained within the ... Church to the ministry of the Church of God, and art now called to the ministry of the Church of God within the Church of North India/Pakistan, mayest thou receive from God the power of the Holy Spirit to continue in thee His gifts, and in accordance with His will to bestow on thee grace, commission and authority for the ministry of a presbyter (bishop) of the Church of God within this Church; and take thou authority to preach the Word of God, to fulfil the ministry of reconciliation and to minister Christ's Sacraments in the Church of North India/Pakistan; and see that thou do all these things in brotherly partnership with God's fellow-workers whom in this union of Churches He has made thine ».

One of the greatest liturgical scholars has questioned the use of the words « Mayest thou receive » as a serious departure from the imperative form used where laying on of hands is accompanied by a formula in addition to the ordination prayer. Clearly, such an act of unification can be accepted by Catholics only if it is, in effect, an ordination for those who have not been episcopally ordained, and it is at the best very doubtful whether such an interpretation can be placed upon this rite. Each minister submitting to the laying on of hands is stated already to have been ordained to the ministry of the Church of God. This in itself is a contradiction of Catholic tradition. For us, the ministry of the Church of God is the ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, ordained and consecrated by bishops of the apostolic succession. The ministers of Protestant bodies, however richly they may have been blessed — and we do not deny such blessing — have not been so ordained, and are not of the ministry of the Church of God. On the other hand, if they are already ministers of the Church of God, clearly the unification does not admit them to that ministry. True it could be argued that this ceremony makes them ministers of a different *kind*, but this can hardly be inferred from the text of the Plan. On the contrary, what is sought is a « wider and more effectual fulfilment of their ministry », the basic assumption being that by reason of the divisions of Christendom, all ministries

are limited in scope and authority. This is derived from a theory put forward by the late Dr. Headlam, which sees the ministry as a function of the Church. In a united Church, the argument might run, the ministry has full scope and authority; but in divided Christendom, all ministries are in some way ministries of the Church, and in some way all are defective, being limited to one particular Christian body. For a « full » ministry, unity is a prerequisite. So, in the North Indian Plan, the Act of Union comes first. Thereafter, a full ministry becomes possible, not by ordination — since all are already ministers of the Church — but by bringing together and mutual recognition.

This would seem to be the most apparent and logical interpretation to be placed on this ceremony. It is not re-ordination; nor would it seem to be ordination, and recent Protestant reactions in India make it clear that they do not wish it to be interpreted as such. It is something new, and outside the Catholic tradition of sacramental action. This fact, incidentally, is given specific recognition in the Ceylon Scheme. In view of this novelty, the proposed unification cannot be accepted by Catholics unless it is clear beyond doubt that the grace of Holy Orders will be bestowed on those who have not received episcopal ordination. It is the considered opinion of our Theological Committee that there is no sure ground for supposing that this ceremony will be equivalent to ordination. Indeed, the internal evidence of the Plan points in the opposite direction.

At the moment, events in India suggest that the Plan may well be held up for a long time. It will certainly need drastic modification before we can consider granting a relationship of full communion with those who take part in it. My own view is that such a relationship ought not to be in advance, however the Plan may be amended. There should be an interim period in which the actual life of the new united church can be assessed. Any initial relationship granted to the new body should be temporary and open to revision in the light of its own development.

Over and above all this, there remains the question of relationship with parent bodies. Full communion with Protestant confessions will be maintained, so that visiting nonconformist ministers will be allowed to celebrate Holy Communion. In our opinion, the Lambeth Conference dealt too lightly with this question in asserting that such a relationship need not be a barrier to full communion. No real theological case was, in fact, put forward, and the provinces of the Anglican Communion will be ill-advised to accept this judgment without further study.

* * *

A RECENT REPORT ON THE ECUMENICAL ENDEAVORS OF THE REFORMED COMMUNITY OF TAIZÉ

Over the past number of years Unitas *has made particular reference to the activities of the Calvinist religious community of men at Taizé in France. In* 1954, *for example, this review published an article on the ecumenical movement by the Prior of the Community, Pastor Roger Schutz* (vol. vi, p. 121) *and another the following year by the same author on the role of non-theological factors in religious disunity* (vol. vii, p. 94). *In addition, reviews of books by the theologian of the community of Taizé, Dr. Max Thurian, have appeared from time to time in* Unitas.

The work of this community, which is dedicated especially to the cause of Christian unity, has gone steadily on, and its influence has become increasingly felt in Reformed circles on the continent and elsewhere. Evidence of this can be seen from the following special report which appeared in the Ecumenical Press Bulletin of Geneva for November 20.

Twenty years after its foundation by Prior Roger Schutz, the Reformed Men's resident community of Taizé, situated in a small Burgundy village, reports a membership of forty brothers from Calvinist and Lutheran backgrounds in France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Germany.

The brothers, some laymen and others ordained, agree to a common life of poverty, chastity, and obedience. They have a rule of life that stresses interior silence and meditation on the beatitudes and join three times a day in worship with an accent on intercession for the Church and the world.

Developments in the thought of Taizé are reflected in a recent book by Roger Schutz called *Living God's Today* (Vivre l'Aujourd'hui de Dieu) (1). Printed elegantly but simply by the presses established on the brotherhood's property, the book points up Taizé's current concerns: active presence in movements for church unity and renewal; new forms of service by professionally competent brothers who go out « two by two » to tackle experiments at « strategic points » among the troubled or disinherited masses.

Taizé brothers have recently gone to live among Africans in the populous outskirts of Treichville on the Ivory Coast in West Africa, among Moslems in Algiers, and with the working class population in Marseilles.

---

(1) Reviewed by Fr. Charles Boyer S. J. in *Unitas*, vol. xi, no. 3.

Among centres of church renewal and interconfessional contact currently served by two brothers at a time, are the Montbéliard region of Eastern France and the ecumenical centre of Packard Manse, near Boston, USA.

Taizé itself has become a centre for spiritual seekers who need silence and prayer. Brother Max Thurian and others are engaged in theological research. Thurian's books on worship, marriage and celibacy, Holy Communion ([2]) and confession have been widely read and translated into other languages.

In the village where the brothers live they have established a model farm and taken the initiative in organizing rural cooperatives for surrounding farmers. One brother is a practising country doctor. Others are well-known potters, and there is a painter. The musical life of the community is also creative and lively.

Projects for the future include the setting up of a conference centre in the nearby village of Cormatin. Now under construction, from next summer onward the building will house meetings of people from varied backgrounds to deal with reasons for Christian division and Christian responsibility in social, political, racial, and economic problems today.

Explaining the objectives of the new meeting place, a spokesman of the community writes: « It is apparent that ecumenism is today up against a certain number of confessional prejudices strongly rooted in the great mass of Christian believers: historical situations that tend to solidify because of a lack of objective information, misunderstandings perpetuated by the absence of mutual openness, the isolation of certain areas of Christianity by massive social barriers.

« All these are obstacles to unity between Christians. The Cormatin meetings will endeavour to find out what they are, study them without prejudice, and try to resolve them in a spirit of intelligent love ».

([2]) Ibid.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

National Commission on Faith and Order in Process of Formation in the U. S. A.

The Advisory Committee of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches has recently reported progress towards the realization of a permanent commission which will serve as its counterpart in the United States. It will be formed and supported by the National Council of Churches and the United States Conference for the World Council.

The Reverend W. A. Norgren of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who is director of the NCC's Office of Faith and Order, has declared that plans have already been made for state and regional Faith and Order conferences in which particular attention will be give to contributions on pertinent subjects by youth, higher education, and women's organizations.

At the WCC headquarters in Geneva, Dr. Keith Bridston, executive secretary of the Office of Faith and Order, hailed the announcement as evidence of progress in the ecumenical relations of American churches. He said that it is « an encouraging sign that the American churches have sufficient confidence in one another to face their basic differences frankly, openly, and together, and an indication that the common faith in the essential oneness of the Church of Christ is now strong enough among them to expose these ' irreconcilables ' of faith and order to ecumenical study and discussion ».

The national commission for the United States is a realization of the proposal to set up such an organization made at the first North American Conference on Faith and Order at Oberlin, Ohio, in 1957. The following year the plan for the commission was ratified by the NCC General Board as a theological venture into the area of order and organization and as a study of the « ecclesiological significance of local, state, and national church councils ». (*EPS*)

* * *

General Secretary of W.C.C. Suggests Directive Power for World Council

Speaking at the opening of the eighth term of the Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies at Bossey, Switzerland, in late October, the General Secretary of the World Council, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, suggested that the time is at hand to determine « whether the World Council should, at certain points, give certain direction to the churches ». Dr. Visser 't Hooft, a Dutch Reformed minister who has been a leader in the Protestant ecumenical movement for two decades, said further that the movement for Christian unity has entered a phase of « extension, complication, and development ».

« We see that unity cannot be a unity that is empty », he said. « It must be at the same time a unity that is a renewal. The question now arises whether it is the task of the World Council of Churches to bring the churches together and let them draw their own conclusions, or whether the World Council should, at certain points, give certain direction to the churches ».

(Under the constitution adopted when the World Council was formally organized at Amsterdam in 1948, the Council has no legislative power or authority over the participating churches. Thus its acts are solely of an advisory character, depending on the member churches' acceptance for their implementation).

The World Council leader declared that « the time is past » when the ecumenical movement was simply one « of Christian people who had some general interest, some vague good will toward each other, and some general hope that the Church would play its part in the world ». He said that « today, we need serious, mature leaders who will carry forward the life of the movement ». As a result of its growth and the new interest in it, he continued, « the way in which the ecumenical movement defines itself becomes of greater importance all the time ».

Dr. Visser 't Hooft, in referring to the new complexity of the ecumenical movement, attributed this to what he termed the emergence of the Roman Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church as potentially active centers of ecumenism. « The Roman Catholic Church », he remarked, « has seen the ecumenical movement as important for the total life of the Church, and we must take seriously this interest of theirs ».

Calling attention to the recent visit of the two representatives of the Moscow Patriarchate to the World Council headquarters at Geneva and to the meeting of the Council's Central Committee last August at Rhodes, and also to the projected visit of World Council

leaders to Moscow in December, the General Secretary said that « on the whole there are reasons to believe that we can work out good relations with the Moscow Patriarchate in the coming years ». (*NC*)

* * *

Noted Catholic Ecumenist Speaks at Lutheran-sponsored Meeting

Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox church members should develop better relationships by meeting together at the grass roots level in small groups. This is the appeal made by Father Gustave Weigel, S. J., distinguished professor of ecclesiology at Woodstock College, a Jesuit seminary in Maryland, and a foremost Catholic authority on the Protestant unity movement and its implications for Catholicism. Father Weigel was one of the participants in a Lutheran-sponsored meeting called the first Annual Ecumenical Institute of Toledo, Ohio.

The four-hour sesson, attended by 130 clergymen of the area, including 35 Catholic priests, was arranged by Dr. C. Uhmau Wold, pastor of St. Paul Lutheran Church, and held in a parish assembly room.

Father Weigel made no detailed elaboration of his recommendation, but he told reporters that he thought the sessions should be informal and that theologians should be present. The laity, too, should be welcomed. There should be frankness at such discussions, added Father Weigel. He said that in matters of religion, Christians are « too sensitive », and this is another reason why they should meet together. « Many problems are solved by solving other problems », he said. « Usually when we come to know one another, we find things are different than we thought in the beginning ».

While advocating new relationships that would mean an end to hostility, the Jesuit also said that what had become « encrusted » cannot be cut off in one stroke, but must be worn off. He added that human efforts alone will never bring about a union of churches; rather Christians should do their work of living up to the Gospel law of love and have trust that God will, in His time and in His way, bring about the fulfillment of the « Una Sancta », the one Holy Church.

« The great Christian law », continued the noted ecumenist, « is the law of love for all men, and when it is observed it draws men together. Perfect love produces perfect union, but imperfect love is still unifying even though the union is less than perfect.

Human beings must learn to live with their imperfection because it is an inescapable condition.

« Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox all accept the law of love. For all it is logical by their own theologies that charity embraces God and neighbor. When they look on the other Christian with this love, the situation has changed. This we see clearly.

« In its relatively short history, the ecumenical movement has broken down the rancors of centuries. The different churches do get along better today than they did 50 years ago. We recognize one another; we see good will in each other; we hold converse with each other. We still feel some irritation, but we are manfully and not without success overcoming it », he said.

Father Weigel spoke of the efforts of Protestant leaders in bringing about the convention on Faith and Order and the conference on Life and Work which led to the establishment of the World Council of Churches, and of the stimulation of these efforts on Catholics. He likewise touched upon such endeavors as led to the Lutheran-Catholic Una Sancta association for mutual understanding in Germany, the Catholic International Conference for Ecumenical Questions, and Unitas.

These developments, Father Weigel said, have resulted in the use of the word « ecumenical » in a new sense, as « any action, aspiration, or association that exists or functions to produce out of the plurality of churches a Una Sancta ». In this sense, « ecumenical » is a church union movement, he said.

His Holiness Pope John XXIII, concluded the Jesuit theologian, in announcing that he would call an ecumenical council, used the word in its traditional sense as a meeting of the Church's leading officials from all over the world. (*NC*)

* * *

Lutheran Scholar Praises Catholics for Knowledge of Protestant Theology

According to a member of the special Lutheran World Federation research commission, the Catholic Church is much further advanced in its study of Protestant theology than are Protestants in their study of Roman Catholicism. This view was expressed by Dr. George A. Lindbeck, assistant professor of medieval thought at Yale Divinity School, in an address at the annual conference of New England's Augustana Lutheran pastors held at Newport, Rhode Island early in October. Professor Lindbeck said that that

was one reason for the establishment by the LWF of its Institute for Inter-Confessional Research.

The Institute, which will begin its activity in January, came into being because changed relations between Catholicism and Lutheranism, particularly in Germany and France, have made new studies desirable, the Yale professor stated. Among other reasons for its foundation, he added, is a Lutheran conviction that « we and Roman Catholics are in fact one in Christ », that Catholics are « brethren in Christ from whom we are painfully separated ».

In his address, Dr. Lindbeck pointed out that Catholic theologians some years ago set up an institute at Paderborn, Germany, to study Protestantism and that more recently they established another in France to study Eastern Orthodoxy. Affirming that the « best books on contemporary Protestant theology now are written by Roman Catholics », the Lutheran scholar cited three books by Catholic writers on Swiss theologian Karl Barth and two on Rudolf Bultmann, a German theologian.

Of the Protestants now making a study of Catholicism, the three furthest advanced, according to Dr. Lindbeck, are Lutherans. He listed these as Dr. K. E. Skydsgaard, professor of theology in the University of Copenhagen, who will inaugurate the LWF institute's research program; Dr. Jaroslav Pelikan, professor of historical theology on the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago; and Professor Walter Von Loewenich, a German theologian whose works have not yet been translated into English. (*RNS*)

* * *

German Lutheran Pastor Calls Rome the Key to Christian Unity

The cornerstone of Christian unity lies in the « Roman mother Church under the leadership of the Bishop of Rome », according to a Lutheran minister who in late years has been a close associate of Dr. Hans Asmussen, a leading ecumenical leader in Germany.

This point was made by the Reverend Max Lackmann in a book that he has recently published in Cologne entitled *Catholic Unity and the Confessio Augustana.* In this work he sustains the thesis that the Augsburg Confession — the chief standard of faith in the Lutheran bodies, which was drawn up in 1530 and approved by Martin Luther — could serve as a starting point for discussions between the Catholic Church and Protestantism.

« We are sons and daughters of one mother Church », declares

Dr. Lackmann, « and we live together on the historical common ground of Catholic tradition by virtue of the visible Catholic and Apostolic Church ».

He says further that Christian unity can be achieved only if « the separated Christians get together again in Christ, in whom they were reborn together into eternal life and in the faith of salvation —that is in the Roman mother Church under the leadership of the Bishop of Rome ».

According to Dr. Lackmann, Christian unity cannot really be created anew, but exists already. What is needed is to implement it, he says. He holds that the authors of the Augsburg Confession never meant to break away from the mother Church. They only meant to appeal to universal Christianity to correct what they believed were untenable positions, he affirms, and to bring about reforms within the Catholic Church.

« Lutherans really were not rebels and revolutionaries at all, but wanted to be catholic in the fullest meaning of the term », writes Dr. Lackmann. He likewise expresses the hope that consequently at the coming ecumenical council announced by His Holiness Pope John XXIII, they will not be considered simply as heretics obliged to come back to the common fold. (*The Pilot*)

* * *

Archbishop Iakovos Restates Views on Efforts for Christian Unity

Addressing the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Cooperstown, New York, at the end of October, Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, reaffirmed the willingness of the Orthodox Church to hold « ecumenical dialogues » with the Roman Catholic Church if the intention of such dialogues is the eventual inclusion of Protestant groups. The Archbishop, who is also a president of the World Council of Churches, excluded what he termed « the formation of bilateral fronts of conventional unity ».

Stressing the need for a more serious consideration of Christian unity, Archbishop Iakovos said: « The reunion of churches is not simply a matter of discussion. It is the duty and obligation of all of us. What is needed more than anything else today for ' ecclesiastical reunion ' is: the unity of our hearts; the fortification of respect and trust in our relationships; a united front in the face of the disturbing domestic and international issues; and humbleness before Christ and the total giving of ourselves to His Gospel ».

The Orthodox spokesman stated further that the Ecumenical Patriarchate had at no time hesitated « to speak freely and conscientiously to all the churches; the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Anglican, and the Old Catholic as well as other churches belonging to the World Council of Churches ». In this, he said, the Orthodox Church was « often literally alone in her efforts for the reunion of churches ». (*EPS*)

* * *

Orthodox Metropolitan Advocates Unity Talks with Rome

Archbishop Anthony Bashir of New York, Metropolitan of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church of North America, has expressed the view that any effective discussions of Christian unity « must be restricted to Orthodox Catholics and Roman Catholics ». The inclusion of Protestants in such an endeavor, he said, « could only result in chaos because of the enormous basic doctrinal divergences from both Orthodox and Romans ».

Archbishop Bashir's stand was given in an official statement released in New York as a clarification of his basic convictions regarding church unity and because his « most positive and encouraging responses » to Pope John XXIII's announcement of an ecumenical council had been « quoted and misquoted in the public and church press and elsewhere ».

Praising the forthcoming council, the Metropolitan called it a « tremendous achievement » and said that the opposition or indifference of some Orthodox spokesmen, « the evident alarm of some Protestant ecumenists and the extreme caution of later comments from Rome » do not take away from the « value of this truly courageous act ». To Archbishop Bashir's mind, of all the efforts for Christian unity since the first World War, « the most encouraging event from the viewpoint of the Orthodox Church has been the suggestion by Pope John XXIII that serious consideration be given to Orthodox and Roman reunion ».

As a practical step in that direction, the Metropolitan suggested that the Pope, as Primate of the West, should begin by joining with Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras of Istanbul, as Primate of the East, in calling for a joint meeting of theologians and canonists from both churches. « The meeting which would follow », he said, « although it might not arrive at immediate union, would provide an opportunity for the Holy Spirit to act, and might well lead to eventual unity ». (*EPS*)

* * *

Catholic Biblical Scholars Suggest Adaptation of Protestant Version of Bible for Catholics

In a contribution to *Worship,* a periodical published by the Benedictine Order at Collegeville, Minnesota, two Catholic Biblical scholars have proposed that Catholics adapt the Protestant Revised Standard Version (RSV) of the Bible into a Catholic edition as a means of furthering Christian unity.

The RSV Bible, according to Benedictine Fathers Bernard Orchard and Edmund Flood « is a scholarly rendering of Scripture which is a delight to read and with very little editing could be made entirely acceptable to English-speaking Catholics ». Some Catholic scholars believe that less than a score of textual changes would be necessary in the RSV Bible to make its text conform to Catholic theology and scriptural usage, they reported.

The two authors of the article in *Worship* emphasized that a Catholic RSV edition, if ecclesiastical approval could be obtained for one, would not replace the Common (or Vulgate) edition of the Bible, used in the Catholic Church. One reason is that « the juridical claim of the Catholic Church to the control of the Bible as such is not recognized by other non-Catholic religious bodies ». Besides, each religious organization would want to keep its own historical version for its own liturgy, the priests pointed out.

If Catholics and Protestants accepted the same version of the Bible, a long step would be taken toward the reunion of Christendom, the article concluded. (*RNS*).

* * *

Church Unity Section Set up in Catholic Prayer Movement

In accordance with instructions given in a letter from the head of the Society of Jesus, the Very Reverend John Baptist Janssens, S. J., the Apostleship of Prayer has just established a Church Unity Section to sollicit the prayers of Catholics for the reunion of Christians. The Apostleship is a world-wide movement directed by the Jesuit Fathers which recommends intentions to be prayed and worked for by its members.

« Desire and hunger for unity among Christians in the Church of Christ », wrote Father Janssens, « grows apace day by day. The

efforts of many of those outside the Church are well known. Ecclesiastical Authority has given its approval to the study of plans to expedite a return to the Church of Christ of all those who seek the truth. The Pope himself has put emphasis on these attempts by his frequently expressed desire to do everything possible to hasten that unity which all seek ».

According to the official instructions of Father Janssens to the Apostleship, « the purpose of this section to pray earnestly for the union of all Christians in the one Church of Christ is to instill in the members of the Apostleship of Prayer a habit of praying for the union of Christians ... to rouse up and nourish in them a spirit of apostolic love which will make them want to work for this union ».

Besides remembering this intention in their Morning Offering every day, members are asked to take part in the Church Unity Octave in January and in the Novena before Pentecost introduced by Pope Leo XIII, and also to promote these exercises. A Holy Hour for Church Unity and the offering of the Mass to beg the reunion of all Christians is likewise recommended.

In order « to instil in themselves and in others an apostolic spirit of unity, members should learn as much as they can and teach others about the pronouncements of the Holy See or the Bishops concerning the Unity Movement » and then to put them into practice. They are also urged to give good example, « especially of brotherly love towards those outside the Church, to strengthen their love of Christ ».

Finally, the letter asks that « members of the Section should meet once a month to discuss those things which have to do with the success of the Section ... and should pursue their studies and efforts in cooperation with the other societies and institutions which have for their purpose the unity of Christians ». (*Una Sancta*).

* * *

Proceedings of First Unionistic Congress at Benedictine Abbey Published

The papers and addresses delivered at the First Unionistic Congress which took place at St. Procopius Abbey, Lisle, Illinois, in September, 1956, have just been published. The volume, which contains a foreword by the late Samuel Cardinal Stritch, is entitled *The Proceedings of the First Unionistic Congress* and is available at the Abbey for the price of $ 1.65 postpaid.

The contents consist of lectures by the Rev. Dr. Francis Dvornik, Ph. D., outstanding Byzantine Historian at Harvard University; the Rev. Theophilus Horacek, S. J., Rector of the Pontifical Russian College in Rome; M. Elias Denissoff, Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy at Notre Dame University; the Rt. Rev. Abbot of St. Procopius, Ambrose Ondrak, O. S. B.; the Rev. Joseph Papin, S. T. D., Professor of Theology at Notre Dame University; and the histories of the work for reunion at the Benedictine Monastery of Chevetogne in Belgium and at St. Procopius Abbey at Lisle by the Rev. Georges Landzaat, O. S. B. and Rev. Claude Viktora, O. S. B., monks of the two respective centers for reunion.

Publication is also expected in the near future of the proceedings of the Second Unionistic Congress which was held at Lisle in 1957.

* * *

Survey of Ecumenical Centers Presented in Annual Seminary Publication

The second volume of *At-one-ment,* an annual ecumenical periodical published by the major seminarians of the Society of the Atonement in Washington, has very recently made its appearance.

The first number of last year concerned itself with the ecumenical movement in general, while the subject matter of the current issue consists for the most part of a valuable survey of the principal ecumenical centers in the United States and Europe — non-Catholic as well as Catholic. While not pretending to be exhaustive, the present number of *At-one-ment* offers an impressive amount of information on the unitive activities carried on in these places.

The articles pertaining to this theme are entitled: « The Apostolate of the Information Center », « Ecumenical Centers for the Oriental Apostolate », « The Byzantine Institute of Holland », « Una Sancta », « Some European Ecumenical Activities » and « The Unitas Association ».

At-one-ment likewise carries two other interesting articles, one entitled « The Apostolate to the Jews » and the other « Recent Anglican Reunion Attempts ».

In the documentary section, finally, the reader will find two important statements from the Holy See relating to the ecumenical movement: the *Monitum* of the Holy Office of June 8, 1948, and the *Instruction* of the Holy Office of 1949.

* * *

New Lutheran Church in Process of Formation

A constitution for a new Lutheran church in the United States is now being drafted by the Joint Committee on Lutheran Unity which comprises members of the United Lutheran Church in America, the Augustana Lutheran Church, the Suomi Synod, and the American Evangelical Lutheran Church. If present plans materialize, the amalgamation of these four bodies is expected to be realized at a constituting convention in 1962. The merger in question involves some 3,000,000 Lutherans, making an eventual new Lutheran Church the largest of that communion in the United States.

In one of the articles for the constitution already approved by the Joint Committee in Chicago, the proposed new body pledges itself to « participate in ecumenical Christian activities, contributing its witness and work and co-operating with other churches which confess God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ».

It states further that the new church will « strive for the unification of all Lutherans within its boundaries in one church and take constructive measures leading thereto ». (*EPS*).

* * *

Well-known English Ecumenist Dies

The Reverend Dom Bede Winslow, of the Order of St. Benedict and one of England's outstanding ecumenists, died suddenly at the end of October. A member of the Benedictine community at Ramsgate, Dom Bede was, to the time of his death, the editor of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly,* which he founded in 1936. Over the years his review carried many illuminating articles and notes on the history, theology, and liturgy of the Churches of the East, and did much to bring an inspiring knowledge of them to its readers.

Having come to the Church of Rome from Anglicanism, Father Winslow had always a particular interest in the cause of reunion, above all with respect to the separated communities of the East. Thus it was that immediately after his ordination in 1922 he began in earnest his long and devoted study of the Eastern Churches. This led in time to his becoming one of the founders in 1926 of the Society of St. John Chrysostom in England, an organization dedicated to Eastern Christianity and reunion. After a number of years this Society felt unable to continue its organized activity, but this past year has happily seen its restoration.

A man of deep erudition and remarkable kindness, the figure of Dom Bede Winslow will be missed by those who knew him personally or through the pages of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly;* and it is to be hoped that the important work he so faithfully carried on these past decades will be continued by those who shared his ideals.

BOOK REVIEWS

Some late catholic books on protestantism

The publication, during the last two years, of several books on Protestantism written by Catholics and destined for our own public, shows our increased interest to know what our separated brethren hold, or what they stand for in matters of faith and morals. The sign is encouraging indeed. It proves that, in our contacts with them, we do not intend to be directed by prejudices, but by the best information that is available. Of course, there will still be disagreements as to the interpretation of the facts reported. This is, to a great extent, unavoidable. The color of the glasses we wear changes the shades of the panorama which is set before our eyes. However, the mere attempt at being objective is an asset to our fairness. It will show the reader where the truth lies. Books of this type, full of information, fair in their judgment and presented in a friendly manner are a contribution to our mutual understanding and a prerequisite to any truly ecumenical conversation.

These have been my thoughts while perusing a series of studies which of late have come to my knowledge. Needless to say, what follows is not intended to be a thorough review of them, but rather a general evaluation of what their almost simultaneous appearance in the Catholic Book market means. One of the volumes comes from America and is written for American Catholics. Another has been done by a scholar who has a background of both European and American Protestantism. The third and fourth contain the opinions of two European writers, one on Anglicanism and the other on Modern Sects.

* * *

Separated Brethren, by William J. Whalen (The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1957) bears the sub-title: *A Survey of Non-Catholic Christian Denominations in the United States.* The volume comes only a few months after Fr. Hardon's *The Protestant Churches in America* (1) and it is a good companion to it. One finds

(1) Fr. Hardon's book was reviewed in *Unitas,* Vol. IX, p. 144.

many things worthy of attention in its pages. I like especially the introductory chapters regarding the present-day status of Protestantism in America and the basic differences between us. The Catholic reader should know them. His daily contacts with people from other faiths makes such information imperative. The statistics on pages 3 and 5, as well as those taken from Landis's *Year Book of American Churches, 1958* at the end of the book, will help him to know the strength of his own and of the other churches in the religious panorama of the country. The chart on the *Genealogy of Major Christian Churches, Sects and Cults in the U. S.* is extremely valuable, among other things, to lead the reader — after he has studied the book — through the labyrinth of American Protestant denominations. Let me add a word about the pictures which illustrate the book. They are excellent and convey a good idea of their religious services, evangelistic work, convocations, and General Assemblies.

The various chapters of the volume are well-written. There is not only plenty of information, but also a clear, concrete, and careful way of putting it. Mr. Whalen has avoided rhetoric, limiting himself to the mere presentation of facts. For my part, I am glad he has devoted so much of the book to those Protestant institutions (Mormons, Millenarist and Pentecostal groups, Interdenominational Societies, etc.) which we — on this side of the Atlantic — are easily led to label as *Ersatz - Protestantism.* Whatever they might be through the standards of pure orthodoxy, they are in our days part and parcel of Protestant work and should no longer be omitted in our manuals. In this sense, Chapter XXI on *International Activities* deserves to be enlarged upon. The work of the Bible Society is hardly hinted at, and the whole aspect of Protestant Missionary Work — one of the most magnificent in pagan lands — has been totally forgotten.

But, these are minor shortcomings. All in all, the book is excellent. From the Preface — which as usual I read after having studied the whole book, I see that Mr. W. J. Whalen is a layman who thinks it his first duty to thank his wife « who read the manuscript chapter by chapter, offered innumerable suggestions and maintained those conditions of domestic tranquillity conducive to writing ». This deserves double praise. The book is not from « a professional », but from a man who — out of personal conviction — has seen the importance of getting acquainted with our separated brethren. You have done an excellent job, Mr. Whalen, and have set a good example to others.

* * *

The well-known French writer and publicist Daniel-Rops a few years ago launched a collection of small volumes under the general title of *Je Sais - Je Crois*: *Encyclopédie du Catholique au XXème siècle*, Paris, Fayard, 1956. (They are being translated and published in English by Hawthorn Books, New York, 11). The collection includes a section devoted to our separated Brethren. The three following volumes belong to it.

We start with Fr. George Tavard's *Le Protestantisme*, 1958. Its author, long a resident of the United States, is specially prepared for the task. His former publications have given him a good insight into Protestantism, both in Europe and in the United States. Tavard is also a theologian and has studied the Reformed movements from the inside. Probably his main difficulty has been putting in a nutshell his considerable knowledge on the matter. It is indeed a gigantic enterprise even to attempt to give an outline of Protestantism in a little more than a hundred pages.

Nine chapters make up the book. The first looks at the origins of what has been « the greatest schism in Church History ». There is little said here of that long and silent preparation — with shortcomings and human miseries on both sides — which made possible the outburst of the Lutheran revolution. The writer goes straight to the Reformers. Of these, Luther is presented as the originator — almost as the sower — of the Reformation, while the greatest importance is given to Calvin. Not all the historians will agree with such a perspective which, on the other hand, is held by not a few French historians. Indeed, there is little substantial novelty in Calvin's theology. Not only the great principles, but also the definitive chasm with Rome were already accomplished facts with the Germans. The Holy See did not even see fit to issue another Bull condemning Calvin. Most of his doctrines had been included in the *Esxurge Domine*, of Pope Leo X, 1520. There are three chapters devoted to the great doctrinal differences between Protestantism and the Catholic Church — and they contain an able resumé of the whole difficult question. Unlike many European writers, Tavard reminds his readers of the importance of Revivals in the whole process of Protestant history. There are also two good chapters on the place of Liberalism and of Neo-Orthodoxy within the framework of present-day Reformed Churches. But in the section dealing with modern Protestant expansion, not a word is said of Protestant infiltrations in Latin America. Whatever the motives, this is a most regrettable omission when the separated churches are making of those traditionally Catholic countries their « first mission land in the world ». In a book written for Catholics, an issue so much at heart to the Holy See should find certainly a place. The book concludes with

a chapter on the Ecumenical Movement, well-balanced and written with all the warmth the great cause of Unionism finds in a true Catholic.

L'Anglicanisme, by André D. Toledano, Paris, 1957, has the advantage of being more restricted in scope — although Anglicanism by itself is a large field to work on. The author is a prolific writer who is very familiar with Anglican problems, as is evident from some of his former writings. The present volume becomes very readable as one goes through its pages and sees unfolding before his eyes that outcome of the Reformation which one of its bishops, Stephen Neill, has termed « this strange world-wide body called the Anglican Church ».

Of its two parts — Anglicanism Past and Present — I like the former most of all. The historical sketches are extremely well conceived. The portraits of the persons who played important roles will not be equally judged by all, but Toledano has made an effort to be fair to them — even when one might be tempted to some comments on their deeds towards their own Catholic countrymen. Probably Hilaire Belloc would not approve of some of them (by the way, his name is not even mentioned in the Bibliography) but Belloc was defending a cause, while Toledano takes care not to hurt Anglicans, even in matters in which some of them (mostly those from the High Church) would not fail to make the appropriate remark. The second part endeavors to acquaint the reader with the organization and administration of the Anglican Church. The aim is fairly well attained, and one is glad to know so many details regarding the hierarchical structure, the parish life, the way to conduct finances and the mission work carried on by the established church in various parts of the world. The writer stresses well the important part played by Anglicanism in the Ecumenical Movement.

I know that in the limited space allotted the writers in these volumes, many issues must be dropped or must be left to the specialists. My regrets for the present volume refer mostly to the theological aspects of modern Anglicanism. The profound division of the big church into three incompatible parties — High, Low and Broad Church — is not stressed. And, as Fr. Joseph Gill, S. J. in so many of his scholarly papers has remarked, this is a *sine qua non* for the adequate understanding of the Church of England. Otherwise, the danger remains of misleading unintentionally the readers with terms and expressions which, according to the party one belongs to, contain a completely divergent meaning. This *comprehensiveness* (of which a few words are said in the Preface)

constitutes « a glory » for many Anglicans. To us it remains — to say the least — « the great puzzle » of that great church.

Sects and Cults have been termed —perhaps with some exaggeration — « the third force » in present-day Protestantism. In any case, they should be given some space in books and papers dealing with that subject. Let us, therefore, welcome Daniel-Rops' idea of devoting a volume to it. The task has been entrusted to Maurice Colinon whose researches on this field have been a good preparation for his new book, *Le Phénomène des Sects au XXe Siecle*, 1959. The book has undoubtedly its merits. Of the three parts, only the first and the second have a bearing on Protestantism — the third being about dissidence among modern Catholic Groups. The division adopted of *Sects of Protestant Origins* and *Healing Sects* will raise more than an objection among the specialists, but it is hard to find a common pattern in a matter so fluid as that of the sects. The remark might be applied also to the choice of this or that group and the rejection of others usually contained in various manuals. Finally, the shock one experiences when looking at the Bibliography and at the absence of any reference to English and American publications, is « explained » to us by saying (p. 11) that the book is written with a view to existing needs in France.

Two great groups comprise the first part of the small volume, that of the *Millenarists* and that of *Pentecostals*. The accounts of their origins and characteristics are given in such a way that the man-on-the-street will be able to catch the essentials of the movements. For the same purpose, the writer goes on to describe the organization and mostly the liturgy of these rather strange denominations. Among the *Healing Sects*, those of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy (*Christian Science*), of L. Antoine (*L'Antoinisme*) and of G. Montfaret (*L'Eglise Chrétienne Universelle*) have been chosen as specimens. The last two have a very limited and national range. Not only for the United States, but also for the whole of Latin America and most mission lands, the *healing work* is actually done by other Pentecostal sects or by *healing-evangelists* of the type of Oral Roberts. The information for these movements will be found in other books, starting from E. T. Clark's *The Small Sects in America*, Abingdom, 1949.

A final remark concerning this subject. There are a few items I would like see explained in such treatises. First, the connection — or disassociation if that be the case — of these modern *sectarian* movements with the original Reformation or with some of its later out-bursts. Msgr. Ronald Knox in his *Enthusiasm*, Oxford, 1951, already gave us a good start. Secondly, the secret attraction of these healing and pentecostal — or millenarist —

movements among the lower strata of our society, needs an explanation. It constitutes a tremendously real and disturbing fact which defies many ready-made answers. This would lead us to find a way of counteracting their obnoxious action among the faithful. Protestants are already worried about the whole outcome for their own churches. The *Zondervan Publishing House,* Grand Rapids, Michigan, is editing a series of books with this purpose. Something also has been done among us. But it is by no means enough.

Let me end this review with a note of joy at seeing Catholics interested in a truly Christian spirit in the life and doctrines of their separated brethren. Noting the importance of some of these publications, one reviewer in the *Christian Century* (October, 14, 1959) thinks « they disclose new and deep stirrings within the Roman Catholic Church ». They certainly do, although not perhaps with all the suppositions he chooses to make. We believe — as we have always done — that the first step for a real mutual understanding lies in the knowledge of our own positions. If this be done with sincerity, without undue concessions to our truths, the way will be open to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit who wishes us to be once more re-united into the One Great Church.

PRUDENCIO DAMBORIENA, S. J.
Gregorian University, Rome.

IRÉNÉE BEAUBIEN, S. J., *Towards Christian Unity in Canada.* Montreal: Palm Publishers 184 pages.

This book by Fr. Irénée Beaubien, which has been published both in French and in English, deserves a wide circle of readers. It is a work that inspires zeal for genuine Christian unity by suggesting various means of working towards it.

The book itself consists of two sections, the first of which deals with the situation of non-Catholics in Canada at the present time. Of these, the most important group is that of the United Church of Canada. Next in order of importance come the Anglicans, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Lutherans. The proportion of Catholics to the general population exceeds 46 per cent.

More than an ecumenical endeavour, the activity of Father Beaubien is rather that of a clear and convincing presentation of the Catholic position to the non-Catholic mind. One of his methods is the « research forum ». This consists of a series of lectures for adults, publicized beforehand, in which the teaching of the Catholic

Church is irenically explained. Besides being the promoter of centers of Catholic information which are open to all, the author likewise brings to the reader's attention techniques calculated to bring the Catholic message to a very wide public — and all this in an atmosphere of prayer, of respect, and of charity.

The second part of this volume is made up of a number of accounts of persons who have become Catholics. There are eleven of these, interesting as well as varied, which serve to confirm the conviction of Father Beaubien, namely, that once the Catholic Church is known as she really is, conversion is quite possible.

D. L.

E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World. A Survey from the French Revolution to the present.* London 1958; 332 pages; 30 shills.

The author has already published two books dealing with the nineteenth century, and particularly the nineteenth century in Italy. He comes, therefore, to the task he set himself in this work well prepared.

This book begins with a preliminary chapter on the background of the French Revolution, an introduction essential to make the attitude of the French clergy during the Revolution itself (described in the next chapter) intelligible to the reader. Napoleon and his coronation by Pius VII in Paris; the intellectual movements in France and the revolutionary ones in Italy; the growth of Catholicism in America and its dangers, and the restoration of the hierarchies of England and Holland; the Vatican Council and the loss of Rome; Old Catholics, Kulturkampf, Modernism, Fascism, Naziism, two world wars, and Communism — all these as they arose in the unfolding of history are outlined and assessed, and the papal action that met them is described and in some cases mildly criticised.

The author has acquitted himself of his task well. The first half of the book is perhaps the more solid. The second half, wherein events that involved the Church were more frequent and more widespread, is in places, almost necessarily, a little superficial, and because of that it occasionally contains statements so general as to be not quite accurate. (Was *L'Action Française* condemned merely because Rome chose the Left instead of the Right?) But to survey the action of the Church in the religious, political, social and cultural spheres over nearly two modern cen-

turies of history requires broad knowledge and much restraint to preserve proportions. These qualities the author manifests, and the reader benefits by them, getting from his perusal of this book a balanced, general picture of the travails and the triumphs of the Church, which will help him also to understand and appreciate the situation of today.

J. Gill, S. J.

INDEX FOR VOLUME XI

ARTICLES

BOYER, S. J., CHARLES,
At What Point Do We Find the Ecumenical Movement Today? . . . . . II, 6
The Different Senses of the Word 'Ecumenical' . . . I, 6
The Encyclical « Ad Petri Cathedram » . . . . . III, 171

CORNELIS, A. A., JEROME,
The General Council: the Hope of Unity . . . . . II, 85
The Centenary of a Memorable Russian Priest: Father Gregory Schuvaloff . . . . . IV, 283

CRANNY, S. A., TITUS,
The Reception of the Society of the Atonement into the Church of Rome . . . . . III, 189

DOUGHERTY, S. A., KENNETH,
Marian Devotion among Anglo-Catholic Religious Communities . . . . . II. 95

GILL, S. J., JOSEPH,
Anglicans and Russians Discuss Theology . . . . I, 23
Personalities of the Council of Florence: IV, Mark Eugenicus, Metropolitan of Ephesus . . . . . II, 120
Personalities of the Council of Florence: V, Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia . . . . . IV, 263

HANAHOE, S. A., EDWARD,
A Note on the Papal Emphasis in the Chair of Unity Octave I, 10

HESS, HAMILTON,
Anglicanism and Essential Unity . . . . . IV, 276

KRITZECK, Ph. D., JAMES,
Islam and Christian Unity . . . . . III, 196

LEEMING, S. J., BERNARD,
Principles of Catholic Ecumenism . . . . . II, 104

LESKOVEC, S. J., PAUL,
The Forthcoming Ecumenical Council as Seen by Three Russian Theologians . . . . . II, 107

TOMAINO, S. A., GERMANUS,
Prayer and Christian Unity . . . . . IV, 249

VUCCINO, A. A., ANTOINE,
Ecumenical Suggestions - apropos of the Views of the Ecumenical Patriarchate . . . . . III, 178

WHITFIELD, DEREK,
St. Francis and Reunion . . . . . IV, 252

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The Forthcoming Council and Christian Unity — a Study by Fr. Fr. C. J. Dumont, O. P. . . . . I, 37
A Letter on Catholic Ecumenism by Bishop François Charrière I, 45
The Message of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople . I, 49
An Anglo-Catholic View of the Nature of the Church (Hamilton Hess) . . . . . I, 51
Four Preparatory Documents of the Vatican Council . . II, 129
The Future of Faith and Order — the View of a World Council Official . . . . . II, 137
A Hebrew Christian Correspondent States His Views on Missions to the Jews (J. H. Fieldsend) . . . . . II, 140
Apropos of the Fourth Centenary of the Confession of La Rochelle . . . . . II, 142
Pope John XXIII and the Unity of the Church — excerpts from the Encyclical . . . . . III, 201
A Council of Union or a Council for Unity — a Report of a German Ecumenical Meeting . . . . . III, 207
A Statement Affecting Anglo-Catholic Reunion with the Holy See . . . . . III, 217
A Papal Letter Commending the Unity Octave of Prayer . IV, 287
Possibilities of Reunion as Seen by two Prelates of Catholic and Orthodox Churches . . . . . IV, 288
An Anglican Commentary on the North Indian Plan of Reunion IV, 292

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Pope John XXIII Announces Intention to Convene Ecumenical Council . . . . . I, 57
Orthodox and Protestant Leaders Express Mingled Reactions to Future Council . . . . . I, 60
Holy Father Commends Observance of Unity Octave . . I, 61
Interconfessional Unity Meeting in London . . . . . I, 62
World Council Executive Committee Meets in Geneva . . I, 63
Fordham Conference Discusses Problems Separating Orthodox from Rome . . . . . I, 64
Dr. Christopher Dawson Sees Growing Trend towards Unity among Christians . . . . . I, 65
Interfaith Discussions Criticized as Centering Too Much On the Sociological . . . . . I, 65
Graymoor Unity Apostolate ask Prayers For Success of Council I, 66
Anglicans Study Merger with other New Zealand Churches I, 67

Presiding Bishop of American Episcopal Church Sees Growing Church Unity . . . . . I, 67
Pope Calls on All Christians To Pray for Success of General Council . . . . . II, 144
Pope Names Preparatory Commission for Ecumenical Council II, 145
Pope John Views Christian Unity as a Gradual Process . II, 146
Ecumenical Patriarch Affirms Good Relations with Rome and Gives Stand on Coming Council . . . . . II, 146
Former President of Lutheran World Federation Comments on Forthcoming Council . . . . . II, 147
World Council Presidents Issue Message for Pentecost . . II, 148
Catholics Obliged To Work For Reunion Of Separatists, Theologian Asserts . . . . . II, 149
Editor Sees Co-operation between Catholics and Protestants Growing in the U. S. . . . . II, 150
Catholic and Russian-Orthodox Relations Discussed by Fordham Jesuit Father . . . . . II, 151
Catholics and Calvinists Unite in Prayer for Peace . . . II, 151
Anglican Bishop Makes Strong Plea for Historic Episcopate . II, 152
Lutherans and Church of South India Move Toward Union . II, 153
Church of Scotland Assembly Votes against « Bishops in Presbytery » Plan . . . . . II, 154
Pope John's First Encyclical Stresses Unity of the Church . III, 219
Pope Indicates Possibility of Non-Catholic Participation in Coming Council . . . . . III, 220
Central Committee of World Council Meets at Rhodes . . III, 221
Expansion of Faith and Order Activities Planned . . . III, 223
A Clarification with Reference to the Meeting at Rhodes . . III, 224
Orthodox Leader Sees Hope for Unity in Coming Council . III, 225
West Berlin Leader Says Undestanding for One Faith Growing III, 226
The Duty of Catholics with Respect to Reunion Emphasized . III, 226
Scholar Expresses View that Same Bible May Be eventually Used by Both Catholics and Protestants . . . . . III, 227
Group to Further Christian Unity is Revived in England . III, 228
Catholic Author Sees Anglican Teaching a Restraining Influence on Doctrinal Disintegration . . . . . III, 229
Former Anglican Editor Begins Studies for the Priesthood in Rome . . . . . III, 229
Chair of Ecumenism Established at University of Louvain . III, 230
National Commission on Faith and Order in Process of Formation in the U.S.A. . . . . IV, 301
General Secretary of W.C.C. Suggests Directive Power for W. Council . . . . . IV, 302
Noted Catholic Ecumenist Speaks at Lutheran-sponsored Meeting . . . . . IV, 303
Lutheran Scholar Praises Catholics for Knowledge of Protestant Theology . . . . . IV, 304
German Lutheran Pastor Calls Rome the Key to Christian Unity IV, 305
Archbishop Iakovos Restates Views on Efforts Towards Unity IV, 306
Orthodox Metropolitan Advocates Unity Talks with Rome . IV, 307
Catholic Biblical Scholars Suggest Adaptation of Protestant Version of Bible for Catholics . . . . . IV, 308
Church Unity Section Set up in Catholic Prayer Movement . IV, 308

Proceedings of First Unionistic Congress at Benedictine Abbey Published . . . . . IV, 309
Survey of Ecumenical Centers Presented in Annual Seminary Publication . . . . . IV, 309
New Lutheran Church in Process of Formation in U.S.A. . IV, 310
The Death of Dom Bede Winslow, Vell-known English Ecumenist . . . . . IV, 311

AROUND THE WORLD

CHINA
Further Confirmation of Government Restrictions on Christian Bodies . . . . . II, 162

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
Communist Paper Admits Failure of Atheistic Propaganda To Win Youth . . . . . I, 73

DENMARK
Danish Lutheran Parish Restores Kyrie and Gloria To Communion Service . . . . . II, 160
Danish High Church Permits Use of Catholic Catechism III, 237

ENGLAND
Anglican Primate Views Religious Situation in East Germany as Crucial . . . . . III, 235

ETHIOPIA
First Patriarch of Ethiopia Enthroned at Cairo . . III, 239

FRANCE
Centenary of Birth of Henry Bergson Observed . . II, 159

GERMANY
East German Bishops Urge Catholics to Shun Compromise I, 73
First Bishop for Ukrainian Catholics in Germany . . II, 158
Catholics and Protestants Resist Communist Measures in East Germany . . . . . III, 236
Prominent Lutheran Minister Deposed for Catholic Views III, 236

GREECE
Government Halts Construction of Church for Byzantine Rite Catholics . . . . . I, 75
Orthodox Missionary Enterprise Being Formed . . . II, 161

HUNGARY
Budapest Catholic Seminary Being « Reorganized » under Government Pressure . . . . . I, 74

ISRAEL
Pope Hopes for Improved Relations with Israel . . III, 238

NORWAY
English Periodical Devotes Special Number to Catholicism in Norway . . . . . I, 74

PAKISTAN
Catholic Ritual Translated into Pakistan Vernacular . .. III, 239

ROME
Pope John XXIII Addresses Letter to People of Rome on Proximate Synod . . . . . I, 69
Holy Father Hails Epistle to the Romans as 'Basis of Christian Theology' . . . . . I, 69
Former Anglican Clergyman Ordained in Rome . . . I, 70
Pope John Receives Greek King and Queen in State Audience . . . . . II, 155
Constitutions for Roman Synod Being Prepared in Draft Form . . . . . II, 156
Inscriptions Strengthen Tradition of Site of St. Peter's Tomb . . . . . II, 156
Pope Declares that Priestly Sanctity is Strength of Church III, 231
Center for Pastoral Study and Information Being Considered at the Vatican . . . . . III, 232

RUSSIA
Resident American Chaplain once more Permitted to Remain at Moscow . . . . . I, 75

SCOTLAND
Episcopalian Churchman Comments on Reformation Centenary . . . . . II, 160
Ancient Scottish Abbey Restored . . . . . III, 235

TIBET
Tibetan Rebellion Attributed to Communist Anti-religious Interference . . . . . II, 163

UNITED STATES
American Bishop Notes Interest of Holy See in Work of United Nations . . . . I, 71
New Greek Orthodox Bishop Elected for the Americas I, 72
Passing of J. Foster Dulles Recalls His Interest in the World Council of Churches . . . . . II, 157
Recent Catholic Statistics . . . . . II, 158
Noted Historian Cites Role of Christian Culture in Western Civilization . . . . . III, 232
Catholic Biblical Association Holds Twenty-second General Meeting . . . . . III, 233
Large Attendance at Byzantine Rite Pilgrimage in Pennsylvania . . . . . III, 234
Church Membership in the United States at Record Level III, 234

BOOK REVIEWS

BEAUBIEN, IRENEE, S. J.,
Towards Christian Unity in Canada . . . . . IV, 329

BRIDGE, THE
A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies, Vol. III, edited by John M. Oesterreicher, (John Vodopivec) . . III, 245

COLINON, MAURICE
Le phenomène des Sects au XX¹ siècle (P. Damboriena, S. J.) . . . . . IV, 317

DE SIMONE, RAFFAELE
Gli Anni decisivi di Storia Valdese: Missioni, repressioni e tolleranza nelle valli Piemontesi dal 1559 *al* 1561 (Charles Boyer, S. J.) . . . . . II, 166

DUGMORE, C. W.
The Mass and the English Reformers, (J. Gill, S. J.) . I, 77
Fragen der Theologie heute, (Edvard Vogt) . . . . . I, 80

GRIGORIOU, P.
Relations Between Catholics and Orthodox, (J. Gill, S. J.) II, 164

HALES, E. E. Y.,
The Catholic Church in the Modern World, (J. Gill) . . IV, 319

HOARE, C.
The Edwardine Ordinal, (J. Gill, S. J.) . . . . . I, 79
Chart of Apostolic Succession, (Joseph Gill, S. J.) . . . III, 248

SCHUTZ, ROGER
Vivre l'aujourd'hui de Dieu (Charles Boyer, S. J.) . . III, 240

TAVARD, GEORGE, A. A.
Le Protestantisme, (P. Damboriena) . . . . . IV, 315

THURIAN, MAX
La Confirmation, consecration des laïcs.
L'Eucharistie, memorial du Seigneur, Sacrifice d'action de grace et d'intercession, (Charles Boyer, S. J.) . . . III, 240

TOLEDANO, ANDRÉ,
L'Anglicanisme, (P. Damboriena) . . . . . IV, 316

VILLAIN, MAURICE
Introduction à l'Oecumenisme, (Charles Boyer, S. J.) . . I, 82

WEIGEL, S. J., GUSTAVE
Faith And Understanding In America, (Edvard Vogt) . . II, 168

WHALEN, WILLIAM,
Separated Brethren (A Survey of non-Catholic Denominations in the United States) (P. Damboriena) . . . IV, 313